The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXXVIII | NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1924 | NUMBER 494

Contents

The Week 320

Editorials
- The American Government and the Dawes Plan 324
- Publicity of Tax Returns 326
- Railroad Adjustment and Arbitration..... 327

General Articles
- Hands Off the Investigations..Felix Frankfurter 329
- "Whether the Dark Had Ushered in the Rain" (Verse).....Maxwell Anderson 331
- The Churches and Social Ethics..R. H. Tawney 332
- A Fisher-Shape (Verse).....Witter Bynner 333
- The Ohio Gang III.....Bruce Bliven 334
- Behind the Wheels.....Frank Ernest Hill 337

A Page of Sonnets..... 339

Correspondence 340

Reviews of Books
- Mr. Firbank's Light Touch....Edmund Wilson 342
- The Goslings .....Joseph K. Hart 343
- Victorian Portraits.....Robert Morss Lovett 344
- Europe Old and New.....Harry Elmer Barnes 344
- Roman Poetry .....Grant Showerman 345
- Recent Fiction 345

The Week

THE French voters at the recent elections expressed clearly their disapproval of the kind of government which France has received from the national bloc. The controlling element in that government has consisted of a group which was more reactionary, less democratic, more clerical and more militarist than the radical socialist group which was governing France in 1914. The election has restored to power the political faction which dominated France for the ten years previous to the war. It foreshadows, in all probability, the resurrection of Caillaux. It prophesies a more liberal domestic policy and a renewed allegiance to the parliamentary Republic. A fascist revolution will meet with much stiffer opposition from the new Chamber than from the old. It is in fact rendered much more improbable. France is now likely to pull through the tensions of the war and the peace without following the example of Italy and submitting to a dictatorship. This is probably the most desirable and encouraging result of the election.

ALTHOUGH the French voters have expressed their condemnation of the government which they have received from the national bloc, it does not follow that they have disapproved M. Poincaré's foreign policy. The leaders of the radical socialists, Messrs. Briand and Herriot, have not opposed the occupation of the Ruhr, and M. Briand, when he was in power, expressed both by his words and by his policy an attitude towards Germany scarcely less vindictive than that of M. Poincaré. The increased power of this group does not mean necessarily any considerable revision of French foreign policy. It is characteristic of extremely aggressive nationalism, such as M. Poincaré's, that it creates perils and antagonisms which bind the behavior of its successors and leave them little freedom of action. The treatment which Germany has received from France since the Armistice has created an intense feeling of hatred towards Frenchmen in the hearts of Germans which may well persuade many moderate Frenchmen to inquire whether they can afford to allow Germany to recover. Europe seems to need a super-government which is strong enough both to protect Germany from France and give her an opportunity to live and prosper, and to protect France from a reconstructed Germany. The League of Nations is neither strong nor disinterested enough to perform this job. Yet until a concert of Europe is formed which is capable of accomplishing it, French nationalism is likely to keep that continent as disturbed as it did in the time of the two Bonapartes, no matter what bourgeois party occupies the Quai d'Orsay.

NEVERTHELESS the French elections will probably improve the chance which the Dawes plan has for getting fairly into operation. There will be a particularly good chance of this result if as an effect of the elections M. Poincaré resigns. In that event the new government, even though it is not pledged to evacuate the Ruhr, is more likely to consent under pressure to evacuation and perhaps even to agree not to return except as a measure of military protection. Messrs. Briand and Herriot are committed to a policy of coöperating

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with Great Britain; they will not be as solicitous as M. Poincaré to justify the policy which his government has followed; and they will be even more desirous than he was of avoiding the discredit and probable disaster which would result from the renewed fall of the franc. If the Dawes plan does get fairly into operation, it will give Europe a breathing space during which the eastern half of that continent can recover from the devastation of the war, in which some balance of power can be restored, and in which the democratic parties in all the nations can recruit their members, revive their self-confidence and clear up their knowledge of what they propose to do. Beyond such an interval of political and economic adjustment it would be fantastic to predict.

IT is already plain that the value of the franc is bound up with the fortunes of the Dawes plan. If the plan is put into operation the franc may be worth six cents or more. If it is dropped the franc is not worth half that sum. The Dawes plan would yield a small amount of direct relief to the French budget from the very start. It would reduce the chance of a desperate German uprising, which France could no doubt put down, but at a cost which would finally bankrupt the nation. Such a settlement as the Dawes plan offers would make possible a revival of European trade, from which France would profit materially. Poincaré is apparently incapable of estimating the benefits of a settlement. His legalistic mind insists on having every point in his past policy validated, even at the risk of the failure of the settlement. French finance and currency must therefore remain in a precarious position until he retires to private life. It is to be hoped that this may be effected without the cost to the people of a new currency débâcle.

WE do not propose to burden our readers with any detailed discussion of the World Court plan of which Senator Lodge is the unblushing parent. It must be plain to anyone with eyes in his head that the Senator from Massachusetts has created his proposal solely for the purpose of embarrassing the effort to have the United States adhere to the court which is already in existence, and has been accepted by forty-seven nations and ratified by the parliaments of thirty-seven of them. Two Presidents of the United States have urged that we enter the Court under the Hughes reservations; a large number of national organizations have endorsed the project; and it seems altogether unlikely that the other nations of the world would agree to scrap their present going concern for the sake of such half-hearted coöperation from the United States as the Lodge plan promises. If the Senator from Massachusetts supposes his scheme has any real chance of success, he is a far less intelligent realist than he is reputed to be; and if he has deliberately put it forth in order to muddy the waters and obstruct the hope of our adherence to the existing court, he is a decidedly cynical practitioner of sordid politics.

PRESIDENT COOLIDGE has now a magnificent opportunity to exhibit the rock-ribbed principles imputed to him in the Republican campaign literature. Two measures of great national importance will soon be on his desk for approval or veto, the immigration bill with Japanese exclusion and the taxation bill with innumerable provisions which the President regards as undesirable, or even dangerous. Will he veto the bills? If he vetoes the immigration bill we shall be back on the 1917 basis when the present quota law expires in June, and the ocean shipping companies will make a splendid harvest pouring immigrants into the country. If he vetoes the taxation bill the income tax payer will have reason to fear that no relief will come to him until next winter. Either veto would probably be sufficient to defeat the Republican national ticket, unless the Democrats display super Democratic stupidity in their nominations. To veto both bills and go down with the ship ought to stand out in history as a deed of heroism worth setting alongside the fidelity to duty of Casabianca on the burning deck.

ON the immigration question the President is less deeply committed than on taxation. The policy of friendly dealings with Japan for which he is standing is an inheritance from earlier administrations. The prestige of the President's office, rather than Mr. Coolidge's personal prestige, is at stake. The fate of the Mellon tax bill, on the other hand, is decidedly a personal concern of Mr. Coolidge. He backed it without reservation. To sign the Senate bill or any compromise measure that can be fixed up in conference would represent a flat surrender. When Mr. Coolidge has digested this bitter dose he may be disposed to reorganize the information service by which he must judge the temper of the country. That service led him to believe that the Mellon plan was exactly what the country wanted, when the truth was that the plan never had the remotest chance with the dominant majority of the people. The income tax payers, especially the richer ones, liked it. Mr. Coolidge's political advisers convinced him that this narrow class was truly representative of public sentiment. Surely he will see the need of a new body of political advisers.

THE McNary-Haugen bill represents so radical a departure from the traditional American conception of governmental functions that under normal political conditions it would be pretty sure to die in committee. Present political conditions, however, are far from normal. The supporters of the bill hold the balance of power in both Houses,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and have shown sufficient determination to force promises from the regulars that the bill will be voted on before the session terminates. It is by no means certain what the vote will be. The section which is demanding the passage of the bill is likely to decide the outcome of the presidential elections. Neither the Republicans nor the Democrats would willingly accept responsibility for defeating it. The final decision may be put to President Coolidge, who cares much for the maintenance of the American legislative tradition, but more for the maintenance of the Republican vote in the next election. We believe that the chances are still against the bill, but its defeat is by no means a foregone conclusion.

THE object of the McNary-Haugen bill is to restore the prewar relation between agricultural and industrial prices. This object is above criticism. Prolonged depression in agriculture which has resulted from the disproportionate fall in prices since the war is injurious to the permanent interests of the nation. Without it the movement of population from the country to the city would be quite rapid enough. It is the method proposed in the bill to which exception may legitimately be taken. To invest large sums of government money in the enterprise of raising agricultural prices is hazardous, financially, and the plan of dumping surplus products abroad may produce complications of its own. The risks involved are grave. But what other remedy for agricultural distress is offered? City agronomists suggest diversification of crops. That is a good thing in itself, but diversification, which means in practice the substitution of dairy farming for grain farming, would promptly result in overproduction of milk, butter and cheese, and a new body of farmers reduced to bankruptcy. A drastic reduction in the tariff, which would enable foreign countries to send their industrial products here and thus to obtain means for buying American food stuffs would be more to the point. But the conservative critics of the McNary-Haugen bill show no disposition to do anything about the tariff. They will have no legitimate ground for complaint if "unsound" remedies are applied when they will not pay the price of sound ones.

THE new Attorney-General has made a good start on his career in office by accepting the resignation of William J. Burns as head of the Bureau of Investigation. The testimony before the Wheeler committee has shown during the past week how the bureau collaborated with the Republican National Committee in the attempt to "smear" Senator Wheeler, in order to halt the Daugherty investigation. This fact, coupled with the previous revelations as to the shadowing of other senators and the rifling of their offices at night obviously made Burns's further continuance in office unthinkable. He has been identified in the public mind with one of the grossest evils of the federal government—an evil which was exacerbated by the war and has grown to vast proportions since then—the use of espionage by the executive branch of the government.

SPYING is dirty work. Decent men usually will not enter it, and it debauches them when they do. Its results are always of questionable value and never justify the use of such huge sums, ranging into millions, as are now being spent for detective operations by the Treasury, the Post Office and the Department of Justice. With Burns out of the way, we now have the right to hope and to demand that the whole sorry crew of wire-tappers, keyhole watchers, letter stealers and gossip collectors will be dumped out as well. We also have a right to expect that an end will be put to the everlasting tales about Bolshevist plots for the overthrow of the government. Every American citizen with the faintest claims to commonsense knows that not for an instant in the past six years, or the past sixty, has there been the slightest danger that our government would be overthrown. These tales have been the exclusive property of labor haters like Daugherty and reputation wreckers like George B. Lockwood. We have had more than enough of both classes.

COLLEGE and university frictions are invariably heavily charged with emotionalism. When such frictions are lifted from the campus to be retold as news for the world, the result is usually a distortion. The press reports of the so-called pacifist episode at Northwestern University, as we have already pointed out, were more than distortions. They were deliberate and malicious falsifications. Events which did not occur were vividly described. Sentences which were never uttered were quoted and attributed to specific persons. Statements which were made were ascribed to the wrong persons and falsely interpreted. The performance from the point of view of newspaper ethics, was one of inexcusable degradation.

IN commenting upon what was presumed to have happened and what was presumed to have been said as reported by the press, the New Republic unfortunately placed Mr. A. J. Elliott, national student secretary of the Young Men's Christian Association, in a false position. Mr. Elliott is so far from being an anti-peace advocate as to stand almost alone among his colleagues as a thoroughgoing and courageous liberal. The student department of the Young Men's Christian Association, under the influence of Sherwood Eddy, Ben Cherrington and Mr. Elliott, has made adjustments to modern intellectual currents which well-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nigh divorce it from the movement as a whole. In Canada the separation is already a reality.

WHEN the Carnegie report on "Justice and the Poor" was published, many persons expressed incredulity as to its conclusion that the poor man often does not get fair treatment at the hands of the law. We invite these critics to contemplate the situation in Chicago where more than a thousand members of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, nearly all of them women, have been on strike for more than two months. A few days after the strike began Judge Denis E. Sullivan of the Superior Court obligingly issued an injunction under the State Anti-Picketing Law, the net effect of which if obeyed would be to require the strikers to go home, sit down with folded hands and wait to see which would come first—starvation, or a heaven-sent change of attitude on the part of the employers. The strikers, not unnaturally, have refused to give up without a struggle and particularly since more than half of the twenty-five hundred who first went out have already gone back to work under the conditions the union demands.

THOSE who are still out have been treated by the law with extraordinary severity and in some cases with brutality. Numbers of them have been arrested as picketers and have been punished with jail sentences of twenty-five or fifty days and fines ranging from $25 to $200. Already $40,000 in fines is said to have been collected. The police and special representatives of State's Attorney Crewe have brutally beaten a number of girls. One policeman, who is not, we trust, representative of Chicago standards of manhood in general, beat a girl so severely that she has been under the care of a physician ever since. We believe that in view of the fact that Chicago wages are substantially smaller than those in other cities and particularly since the industry offers only thirty to forty weeks' employment each year, the strikers' demands for a forty-hour week and a ten percent wage increase are not exorbitant. But whether they are or not, the State of Illinois stains its honor for all time when it employs the law's machinery so brutally and unjustly to support the fight of a few manufacturers against the workers.

FURTHER analysis of the German election results have confirmed our conclusion of last week that the international situation is not radically changed by them. Opposition to the Dawes plan has been somewhat stiffened, but it is still too weak to compel rejection of the plan, unless the French insist on loading it down with political conditions that are unnecessarily humiliating and obstructive. If the French are prepared to evacuate the Ruhr when the plan goes into operation and refrain from imposing a rigid definition of default with automatic military sanctions, the Reichstag as at present constituted is pretty sure to accept the Dawes plan. It would be a futile and dangerous thing for the German government to try to secure the adoption of the plan under other conditions. The result would be a deadlock, followed by a new election which would certainly emphasize the drift to the extreme right and the extreme left which was distinctly observable in the recent election.

THIS spring's nine days' wonder in New York City has been the exploits of a "bob-haired bandit," a young woman who held up a series of small retail stores in Brooklyn and escaped in each instance with the contents of the till. A short time ago she was captured, and discovered to be a twenty-year-old married woman named Cecilia Cooney. When her record was looked up it was found that her father was an habitual drunkard and her mother an indifferent parent who had left her children with equanimity to starve or to be fed through the charity of neighbors. At the age of four Cecilia (the youngest of eight children) was put into the custody of the Children's Society. At fifteen she was at work in a factory, spending her evenings with sailors picked up on the streets. Her twenty years have been years of hunger and cold, of living in cellars and being kept alive by casual charity. It is no wonder that out of such an environment came the determination to pursue "a life of crime;" the wonder is that anyone brought up as Cecilia was ever remains honest. The New York World intelligently observes that "her crimes are on our heads too. . . . Cecilia Cooney is a product of this city, of its neglect and its carelessness, of its indifference and its undercurrents of misery."

A FRIENDLY critic urges that the New Republic misses the point of Secretary Mellon's discussion of tax exempt securities in their relation to the sur-tax. There are about $12,000,000,000 tax exempts outstanding. In addition the state and local governments are manufacturing new securities at the rate of about a billion a year. The New Republic has assumed that the process of tax evasion in practice is nothing but the purchase by the large income recipients of outstanding securities—a process which releases just as much money for industry as it takes out of industry. Our critic thinks Mellon has in mind the newly manufactured securities which absorb money that would otherwise go into industry, and further tempt the states and local governments to extravagant outlays for improvements.

TO this criticism our reply is, first that Mellon pretends to deal with facts, not tendencies, and seeks to explain the marked decline in sur-tax receipts through the flight of capital to tax exempt securities. A billion a year would be a trifling

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cover for the amounts of capital that have run away from the sur-tax. Even the twelve billion outstanding would fall far short of the requirements. Second, there is no evidence whatever that state and local governments have become more extravagant since the sur-tax gave their bonds a relative advantage on the market. If this advantage were highly prized, so that money could be had by states and cities at extremely low rates, it might lead to public extravagances. But it is not highly prized. State and municipal bonds hold about the same position on the market, relatively to railway and corporation bonds, as they did before the sur-tax was imposed. This can be explained only on the ground that the amount of capital of the very rich seeking tax exemption is much less than is commonly supposed. It is not nearly sufficient to take all the tax exempt bonds off the market. Therefore the interest paid on those bonds must be high enough to attract investors to whom exemption from sur-tax is no object—savings banks, life insurance companies, etc.

OUR educational skeleton has been rattled again. M. André Morize, French exchange professor at Harvard, has found out, as the observant foreigner is bound to do, that American education is more imposing architecturally than intellectually. He has identified the elective system as the automat theory of education (though he does not use so impolite an epithet, of course) and he has found that the most vital courses are dished up in a concrete bowl. This is all very real, very sad and very familiar. Professor Morize must certainly have made the further discovery that a substantial number of his American colleagues, probably a large majority, are more keenly aware of the situation and more deeply chagrined by it than a foreigner can possibly be. But since they view it historically they are not particularly depressed by it. They see that these things are the natural result of the tremendous proliferation of schools in America. The "building program," with its conspicuous trail of modified town halls and mausoleums, is simply a manifestation of sudden and unprecedented growth. The capture of the youth of the land follows, with the inevitable bait of "applied arts" and foot ball. But behind these gayly camouflaging bastions educational sapping is going steadily forward. A new bowl is going up at Brown; but a dozen New England colleges are moving toward athletic deflation. And as to Professor Morize's remark that American schools form character while the French train intelligence: may one inquire if French psychology has established that these things are separate?

THE gulf which divides practical politics from reality is well illustrated in the attitude of the congressional leaders toward Victor Berger's resolution on war guilt and treaty revision. Representative Berger, of Wisconsin, the only Socialist at present in either House, wants the President of the United States to call a conference for the revision of the Treaty of Versailles. He also wants a thorough investigation of the war, which would result in a distribution of the guilt among the nations actually responsible. These are certainly two of the most important projects before the world today. The Treaty of Versailles is urgently in need of revision in many of its sections; and the notion that Germany was solely responsible for the war, upon which so many far reaching policies have been predicated, is losing ground with every day that passes. Important as these questions are, however, there is no great organized body of American citizens which wants Mr. Berger's resolution passed. And Congress just now is doing nothing until some powerful external agency supplies the impetus.

The American Government and the Dawes Plan

THE Foreign Offices of the European governments are conducting at present a critically important negotiation whose outcome will bring privation or comparative happiness in the future to hundreds of millions of European people. France, Germany, Italy and Great Britain are trying to agree about the extent to which and the conditions under which the plan of the Dawes commission shall be put into operation. What the result of this negotiation will be is extremely doubtful—much more doubtful, for instance, than the result of any similar negotiation which has taken place since the Armistice. In Paris during the Spring of 1919, in April, 1921, before the London Agreement, and in Genoa a year later Germany did not have a chance. She was disqualified in advance. She could not propose anything which was not wrong, and the only possible joint decisions which could be taken were bound to result in her undoing. But in the negotiation which is now taking place she occupies a stronger strategic position. She has weapons of a certain kind and a few friends. The weapons are not precisely diplomatic dreadnaughts and the friends are lukewarm and furtive. Nevertheless if the friends do not flinch too soon and if they combine with the German government to play their cards skilfully, the negotiation may end by giving back to the German people some measure of recovery, security and self-respect, and in this way give back to Europe some chance of stability and order.

Germany is able in the present negotiation to call to her aid the strength of exhaustion and desperation. The penalties which the victors have imposed upon her have reduced her to temporary economic impotence without benefiting her oppressors. Little by little France and Belgium have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

built up in Germany an effective disposition to resist. At the recent elections there were returned to the Reichstag approximately an equal number of deputies of the two major groups. There is little to choose between the numerical representation of the moderate parties which have favored the formal acceptance of proposed obligations no matter how impossible, and that of the extreme parties which stand for the policy of refusing the further assumptions of burdens which practically all Germans believe to be unjust and intolerable. If Germany is asked to accept another reparations agreement which imposes calamitous penalties for the failure to perform impossible tasks, she will accept, if at all, only after a protest which will be tantamount to a refusal. Such a revolt would be fatal to the success of the Dawes plan or any other proposal for the restoration of Germany to economic solvency.

The Allies could impose bankruptcy on Germany, but they cannot impose recovery on her. She cannot recover except by virtue of her willing participation. They must allow her the benefit of some motive for recovery. The German nationalists realize the consequent improvement in German bargaining power, and they intend to make the most of it. They calculate that if continued bankruptcy of their country spells disaster for their neighbors and if their recovery may bring relative prosperity, they may be able to exchange their consent to their own recovery for some guarantees of future security or an opportunity for self-respecting and fruitful labor. They have little to lose by revolting against a bargain which imposes colossal burdens upon them without holding out any hope of future security and prosperity. They have already drunk deep of the cups of ruin and humiliation. The Allies, on the other hand, still stand to lose a great deal by a continuation of the bankruptcy of Germany and the consequent political and social unrest. They may find themselves forced to recognize that Germany is composed of human beings who cannot be compelled by any further exaggeration of the motive of fear to make the sacrifices which are necessary to her recovery.

These evidences of an improved bargaining power on the part of Germany are parallelled by the evidence of a weakened bargaining power on the part of France. If Germany is fortified by the strength of a desperate exhaustion which emboldens her to cling to her enemies and pull them down to her own level, France is suffering from a demonstration of the limited effectiveness of her weapon of irresistible military force. As long as she had refrained from occupying the Ruhr, she could always hold the threat of occupation as an ugly instrument of torture over Germany, but once she had applied the screws without inducing the victim to disgorge reparations, her nationalist leaders are involved in a difficult dilemma. They must either inflict further penalties on Germany or they must draw back. Inflicting further penalties will alienate the sympathy of the whole of Europe and create an increasing disposition among fair-minded people to go to Germany's rescue. What is worse it will bring financial and ultimately economic disaster on France. French statesmen are haunted by the grisly vision of what might have happened to their country if they had not checked the fall of the franc. The ruin of French credit and the confiscation of a large part of French private property would in the end have meant either a fascist or a proletarian revolution or both. But the value of the franc is only maintained in part by foreign assistance and in part by the prospect of some agreement among the powers which will permit the Dawes plan to go into operation. If the Dawes plan fails to be accepted, the battle of the franc will be resumed with the probabilities of a very different conclusion.

Yet while the Germans occupy a stronger and the French a weaker position than hitherto, it by no means follows that the former will be able without powerful assistance to convert their good diplomatic cards into a better cash bargain. The French internal political situation is ticklish. There is a powerful group in France which does not wish Germany to recover, provided recovery means the deliverance of that country from French domination. This group is weakened by the election but not entirely deprived of power. It is now seeking for some middle course which will start the Dawes plan partly in operation, enable them to float the international loan and prevent a resumption of the flight from the franc. But this middle course, as they conceive it, is to secure reparations for France without securing deliverance to Germany. Any bargain to which they agree must keep Germany trembling in the torture chamber by providing for the reapplication of the screws just as soon as there is any default in an arbitrary, onerous and experimental schedule of payments. A middle course of this kind will in the long run prove fatal to the success of the Dawes plan. For the plan will not work without willing German participation in its operation, and the German nationalists will insist rightly upon the impossibility of extorting loyal participation from Germans in a bargain which leaves the fruits of their recovery at the mercy of an implacable enemy. The dominant French group will nevertheless fight stubbornly and perhaps to the bitter end on behalf of an arrangement which will secure to France the legal right to repeat the occupation of the Ruhr; and they will run great risks rather than yield. In all probability they will not submit to German resistance alone or to a combination of German resistance with British support. They will submit, if at all, only as the result of practically unanimous outside pressure, of which the effective spokesman must be the American government.

The attitude of the American government is, consequently, likely to be decisive as to the result of the negotiations. If it should be persuaded by

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

French diplomacy to favor some middle course which would recognize the continued military occupation of the Ruhr and would contemplate a resumption of the economic control in the event of German default, it is probable that Italy and Great Britain would agree and Germany would again be forced to sign. But if she signed such a bargain, it would be with rebellion, indignation and revenge in her heart. In that event the Germans would surely want and prepare for an early war which might destroy them but which could not destroy them any more effectively than they were being destroyed by the "peaceful" order of Europe. On the other hand if the American government insists that in as much as the Dawes plan cannot successfully operate so long as it is handicapped by the Ruhr occupation and that in as much as the effect of a future reoccupation would be as purely destructive as is the present invasion, the Ruhr must be evacuated and Germany guaranteed comparative security in the future. Then the plan may become an effective instrument of European appeasement and reconstruction. This second course, it is true, involves grave risks. Before France will agree to it, the American government may have to make French statesmen understand by anticipation what the consequences of a refusal to yield may be. It may have to demonstrate how disastrous to French credit abroad would be the sabotaging of the Dawes plan. It will have to incur some disagreeable criticism from French supporters in this country, who would see nothing but pro-Germanism in such a policy. But if it succeeded, it would have accomplished by peaceful means one of the most beneficent victories over military oppression, international anarchy and social disorder the history of diplomacy has to record.

Whether the administration possesses the insight and the will to exert American influence, as it now can, on behalf of European appeasement, we do not know. In the spring of 1921 just before the deplorable London Agreement was forced on Germany, President Harding and his Secretary of State failed lamentably to foresee the disastrous results of that bargain. They either sympathized with the policy of the Allies towards Germany or did not dare or care to oppose it. They were almost equally non-committal when in January, 1923, the French by marching into the Ruhr punished Germany for a bankruptcy which they had forced on her. But perhaps President Coolidge and Mr. Hughes now know more and will do better. They certainly have reason to know more and the opportunity and the power to put their knowledge to good use. The Dawes plan is not merely the verbal expression of admirable intention, like so many American diplomatic documents. It suggests a promising specific way to accomplish a result which is certainly desirable and may prove to be salutary. But it must be accepted, if at all, as a whole, and as a whole it certainly calls for the abandonment of the attitude towards Germany which dictated the reparation clauses of the Versailles Treaty, the London Agreement and the Ruhr invasion. Whether or not the nominal acceptance of the Dawes plan brings with it the veritable abandonment of this vindictive attitude will depend chiefly upon the policy of the American government. It has the power either to insist that the healing and reconciling implications of the Dawes plan be recognized and developed or to allow them to be ignored and suffocated. Let us hope that it will prove equal to the opportunity.

Publicity of Tax Returns

TO tens of thousands of Americans, among them many of the most liberal and public spirited of men, the Senate provision making income tax returns accessible to the general inquirer like any other public documents, is extremely distasteful, if not positively revolting. The feeling is deeply ingrained in most of us that personal incomes are among the ultimate intimacies of life. It is commonly regarded as far more decent to wear one's heart on one's sleeve than one's income. If one must borrow money or go security for a friend, one must of course bare his income, just as one must bare his other privacies when he consults a physician or a psychiatrist. One must confess his income to the tax collector as a good Catholic must confess his sins to the priest. But all such communications are privileged, by law or custom, and it is understood that they remain inviolate at the point where they are placed.

Other objections to publicity are frequently advanced. It is sometimes a distinct business disadvantage to a man to have his income known to his neighbors. A rising lawyer or physician is very likely to carry himself as if he had a comfortable income, even though he may have to draw dangerously upon his patrimony or resort to the even more dangerous expedient of mortgaging his future to the money lender. To him who hath shall be given is a rule applied rather ruthlessly by clients and patients. If the publicity provision goes through, we shall probably have many instances of inverted tax dodging—incomes set down for figures far beyond the facts. Often a man cannot well afford to let his neighbors know that his income is as large as it actually is. Perhaps he is gumshoeing his way toward a fortune and does not want to let others into the vein where it is working. Here publicity of tax returns would fortify the ordinary motives making for understatement of income.

When, however, every allowance has been made for such special circumstances, it must, we believe, be agreed that the practical disadvantages that might result from publicity are insignificant, under modern conditions of life. Moreover, the fact that one's income tax return is accessible in the archives at Washington does not mean that in the ordinary case it will be posted in the town hall

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or published in the local paper. The unreasoned sentiment against the invasion of one's privacies is more worthy of consideration. Yet this sentiment, like many another, must yield when important public interests are concerned.

What would be gained by making income tax returns public? First of all, we should have a new check upon the tax dodging. As matters stand today, it is very easy for a man whose income is derived from a business or the practice of a profession to dodge some part of his taxes, if he wishes to do so. He makes his statement to revenue officials who do not know him or the circumstances of his life. He is aware that some accident may expose any discrepancy between his standard of living and his reported income, and cause him trouble later. But he also knows that the special investigators of the internal revenue service can never scrutinize closely more than a trifling fraction of the returns. In England long experience with a similar situation has led to the building up of an extremely efficient revenue service, with direct sources of information from every important circle of tax payers. There is still a great deal of tax dodging, but nothing as compared to what we have in America. With publicity of returns a host of public spirited citizens and many an envious busybody would in effect be attached to the revenue service. A man would think more than twice before he would seriously understate his income.

The adoption of the principle of publicity would also make accessible an immense amount of information as to the distribution of actual income, the rise, persistence and decline of private fortunes. We should no longer repeat with Secretary Mellon such century-old saws as "from shirt sleeves to shirt sleeves in three generations." We should not have to rely on inferences and guesses in our discussion of the causes of such a decline in particular groups of incomes as has occurred in the highest class of super tax payers.

The corporation making excessive profits, the corporate official drawing a princely salary, are naturally bitterly opposed to the principle of publicity. We may recall the indignation manifested by the privileged when McAdoo made public the profits of coal companies, and when the La Follette committee published the salaries of Standard Oil officials. Publicity is not an adequate check upon greed, but it is useful so far as it goes. Corporations would probably be somewhat less grasping in their price policy, corporation officials somewhat less ready to vote themselves increases in salary, if they knew that any yellow journal could get the facts and make the most of them.

When the advantages to be derived from publicity of income tax returns are fairly weighed against the disadvantages, it becomes a matter for wonder that the principle of publicity was not introduced many years ago. The explanation appears to run in terms of the tendency of personal sentiments and political institutions to lag far behind economic conditions. In a more primitive state there were excellent practical reasons why a man should keep the facts of his income to himself. There was a very direct relation between his effort and his income, his personal efficiency and his prosperity. Today the incomes of a great part of the people are determined by the wage scale and the general conditions of employment. There is no privacy here. There is no privacy of income in public employments. There ought to be none in corporate employments. Only in a limited and steadily narrowing field is privacy of income both practical and desirable. For our economic society as a whole, incomes are determined by social forces, and are properly a matter of public concern. Little by little this condition may be expected to penetrate the consciousness of the people, and the objection to publicity of incomes will disappear, except on the part of those who have something to hide.

Railroad Adjustment and Arbitration

THE attitude of most newspaper editorial columns on the proposal to substitute for the Railroad Labor Board a plan of bipartisan adjustment, supplemented by mediation and voluntary arbitration, furnishes a striking example of the difficulty of securing informed public discussion of labor problems. The editors, with few exceptions, have sprung nobly to the defence of the Labor Board. The Board they say is better than the plan of the Barkley-Howell bill because it contains "representatives of the public." The new plan is iniquitous because it is demanded by the unions. It does not compel the calling in of public arbitration machinery. Therefore, it affronts the public. The editors might add, but usually do not, that the new plan is vigorously opposed by railroad executives.

A more judicial attitude would give rise to the question of how effective or just an arbitration system is likely to be when its support comes exclusively from one of the parties whose cases it is to try. Of course one does not expect criminals to favor a judicial system, and if the unions were to be regarded as dangerous miscreants at the bar who must be dealt with by the public police power, unquestioning support of the Court in the face of union disfavor would be justified. But if one considers the unions rather as equal parties in a contractual relationship, whose contentions with employers must be equitably adjusted, their objections to the present form of arbitration are worth more respectful examination.

It is significant that the commentators pay more attention to the moral support of the Labor Board against the unions than against the employers. In

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its early history, when the Board was establishing the rules which confirmed the status of the unions in the industry, and was readjusting wages upward, the carriers opposed it—with generous support of the newspapers. During this period more than one hundred violations of Labor Board decisions on the part of railroads occurred without appreciable public notice of condemnation. Not until the eve of the shop strike did this hostility shift to support. It was generally admitted during the strike that the railroads had made a "mistake" in not rendering the Board's task easier. This task was generally conceived to be restraining the demands of the unions and suppressing labor trouble. After the strike, attention to the matter subsided. This was evident when the Supreme Court of the United States eventually vacated the injunction which the Pennsylvania Railroad had secured against the Labor Board to prevent censure for failure to hold an employe election in which the legitimate shop unions might be designated as representatives of the men. In spite of a renewed attempt by the Board to force the railroad into line by calling on "public opinion," the issue was so confused in the press that little or no pressure was forthcoming, and the Pennsylvania remained in violation of the Labor Board order. To this day the shopmen and clerks of the Pennsylvania have never had the opportunity in a company election to express their preference as between their own organizations and the "representative system" to which the company extends sole recognition. How many editors called this situation to the attention of their readers when supporting the Labor Board against the Barkley-Howell bill?

As is well known, during the shop strike the example of the Pennsylvania encouraged a large number of other systems to substitute company unions for recognition of the employes' own organizations. In several such cases, where the strike has been officially called off and the strikers have returned to work in numbers, they have petitioned the Labor Board for elections to decide whether a majority of the men prefer to be represented by the new company associations or by the unions. On five systems the shopmen have returned a majority for the regular unions. Yet on most of these systems the railroad refuses to obey the Labor Board or to recognize the labor organizations. One of these cases—that on the Chicago and Alton—is enlightening. According to Labor Board Decision No. 2024, there are approximately fifteen employes now in the service who participated in the formation of the "company union," whereas there are about 2,700 employes altogether, an overwhelming majority of which participated in an election in which "System Federation No. 29 of the Railway Employees Department, A. F. of L., has been designated as the organization and agency through which the shop crafts desire to negotiate changes in the existing rules and rates of pay." Yet, "the carrier sets up the novel plea that it will not recognize or negotiate with the duly authorized representatives of the employes as members of the craft organizations comprising System Federation No. 29 of the Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L., but will recognize and negotiate with the same committee provided the committee will state they are representing an association which no longer exists as far as the employes in question are concerned." What is the "public" doing to back up its "representatives" on the Labor Board to bring the railroads to a policy of good faith on such questions? What can it do?

Is it such cases to which the editorial writers are referring when they state that the Barkley-Howell bill is vicious because it will force the railroads to deal with the standard railroad unions directly?

The fundamental of the situation is that in many instances neither the railroad executives nor the organs of "public opinion" are willing to recognize genuine labor organizations as full participants in the administration of railroad employe problems. The men have learned by experience that they cannot depend on "the public" for attention to their grievances or enforcement of their rights. They are not eager to stake their daily bread on the personal ability, probity or power of "representatives of the public" who are really appointees of a President—just as Daugherty and Fall were presidential appointees. They therefore propose a return to the kind of adjustment of the only sort under which the status of railroad labor has been advanced—a system of direct collective bargaining under which the employes may rest on their own economic power, tempered by mediation. Arbitration machinery is not lacking in this proposal, nor are representatives of the public, but arbitration will be called in, as it should be, by the consent of both sides and as a result of their genuine desire to avoid conflict. When arbitrators are called in, their decision is final. This is the sort of judicial system which can succeed among free men. When the railroad unions have once and for all established their right to exist and function, there will be little difficulty in safeguarding the rights of the public.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1924, IN THE U. S., BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., INC., 421 WEST 21ST ST., NEW YORK. HERBERT CROLY, PRES. ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREAS. DANIEL MEBANE, CIRCULATION MANAGER.

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY BRUCE BLIVEN ROBERT LITTELL
ALVIN JOHNSON R. M. LOVETT STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JANE ADDAMS JOHN DEWEY R. H. TAWNEY
DAVID FRIDAY H. N. BRAILSFORD LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hands Off the Investigations

SO grave were the first disclosures made by the Walsh and Wheeler investigations that the immediate response of the country was profound humiliation. Only the recently disavowed organ of the Republican National Committee ventured brazenly to attack the exposers and minimize the exposure. But, as the effect of the impact of these disclosures wore off, partly because of the very extent of the revelations, public preoccupation with private worries and bewilderment over the variety of complicated issues were exploited by various powerful forces, from a variety of motives ranging from the lowest to moral confusion, all with a view to discrediting investigation and arresting its further progress. The gathering forces against the investigations and the investigators reached their culminating reinforcement in the support of a President who, while professing a desire to vindicate the law, assumes that law and order are bounded by the Penal Code, and helped to create an atmosphere in which necessary investigation could not thrive. The President's lead was promptly followed by such guardians of the public interest as Judge Gary. The most disheartening experience of the Ballinger investigation repeats itself: the condemnation of the most powerful is reserved for the exposers and not for the exposed.

Emboldened by the successful offensive against the pending investigations in Washington, various suggestions are afloat with a view to curbing future Walsh and Wheeler investigations. Professing, of course, that wrong-doing, impropriety and unwholesome standards in public life should be exposed, critics, who have nothing to say for the astounding corruption and corrupting soil which have been brought to light, seek to divert attention and shackle the future by suggesting restrictions in the procedure of future congressional investigations. Not only do members of the Bar thus propose to hamper a power which has been exercised since 1789, but even one of our financiers, who is a self-appointed mentor for all our national ills, urges curbs upon Congress drawn from his deep study of comparative parliamentary procedure.

A proper judgment of the Walsh and Wheeler investigations involves a consideration of (1) the situation which confronted them, (2) their accomplishments, (3) their alleged abuses. Only after such consideration can we properly assess (4) the pertinence of any formal change in the procedure of congressional investigation.

(1) *Situation confronting Walsh and Wheeler.*—When the Harding administration began—in fact preceding it—the air was full of indications of the sinister influences that were to prevail and were prevailing in the conduct of some of the vital departments of the government. Around Fall and Daugherty suspicions steadily clustered. Washington was thick with talk, and not the talk of irresponsibles. As time went on the intimations became more and more outspoken; but every influence of authority, of powerful social connections, of the press, the whole milieu of officialdom in Washington was on the side of those in power and against disclosure and truth-telling. More than that, when things could no longer be stemmed and an investigation of Daugherty's administration was entered upon by a House Committee, the forces of wrong-doing rendered such an investigation abortive and futile, and thereby served to discredit further accusations and their investigation.

For nearly two years the efforts to uncover wrong-doing in the disposal of our public domain were hampered by every conceivable obstruction on the part of those in office and those influential out of office; involving members of the President's official entourage, and including perjury before a Senate committee on the part of one of the closest friends of the late President and one on close terms with the present Executive. The vast investigatorial agencies of the government not only failed to coöperate with the efforts to unearth wrong-doing; they positively sought to frustrate congressional activity.

Governmental machinery, prestige, wealth, agencies of publicity—all were for covering up things. No one who has not had some experience of the power the government *can* exert is able to realize the tremendous pressure against which Walsh and Wheeler were contending. Both the hostile resources and the inertia which they had to overcome were incredible. The odds which they thus encountered must be felt and not merely intellectually admitted and lightly dismissed.

(2) *Accomplishments of Walsh and Wheeler.*—These are beyond question: the bills filed by the government against the Sinclair and Doheny leases are based upon the findings of the Walsh committee, namely, corruption and conspiracy rendered possible through Secretary Fall's corruption and Secretary Denby's guileless incompetence; the disgrace of, and pending grand jury inquiry into, a recent member of the Cabinet—Fall; the resignation of another member through incompetence—Denby; the dismissal of a third member—the Attorney-General—because of an enveloping, malodorous atmosphere.

It is safe to say that never in the history of this country have congressional investigations had to contend with such powerful odds, never have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they so quickly revealed wrong-doing, incompetence, and low public standards on such a wide scale, and never have such investigations resulted so effectively in compelling correction through the dismissal of derelict officials. All this, it must be remembered again and again, was done by Congress against obstructing executive departments and, to put it mildly, unassisted by a President, who, unlike Roosevelt, is not a crusader against wrong-doing.

(3) *Alleged Abuses.*—One would like to have a bill of particulars of these alleged abuses. Objection is frequently taken against irrelevant, unfair, and unsubstantial charges and to the character of some of the witnesses. It is not easy to be patient with such an attitude. What were the irrelevant charges before the Walsh committee, and what were the improprieties in pursuing those charges? Certainly Senator Walsh has established all the charges surrounding the oil leases up to the hilt. Objections are made to the testimony centring around alleged prenomination and preëlection affairs in 1920. Surely it was relevant to ascertain whether interests were on the lookout to put into the Department of the Interior a man who, honestly or dishonestly, held one attitude rather than another towards our natural resources. Necessarily much of this was hearsay and gossip. Nevertheless there emerged definitely the fact that Hamon spent a huge sum of money for campaign purposes. If these aren't "leads" properly to be pursued, then we had better frankly admit that the power of congressional investigation is a sham, and not an effective instrument for ventilating issues for the information of Congress and of the public.

What are the specific objections to be made against the hearings conducted by Senator Wheeler? Of course the character of the witnesses in many instances was disreputable. It is of the essence of the whole Daugherty affair that the Attorney-General of the United States was involved in questionable association with disreputable characters. It is naïvely suggested as to these individuals, that "they are not competent witnesses. But they are exhibits." But in order to be exhibits, they had to be witnesses. This is the kind of hair-splitting that has for decades been attacked as a disgrace to American criminal procedure. In suggesting that Wheeler's witnesses were not competent witnesses but merely "exhibits," perhaps all that was intended was that Senator Wheeler should have preceded the calling of each one of his disreputable witnesses by a speech stating that they were disreputable. Surely this is a naïve suggestion. It is difficult, at best, to get witnesses to talk. This criticism is familiar to everyone who has ever had anything to do with criminal prosecutions, namely, an attempt to divert attention from the misconduct of the defendant to the character of the witnesses against him. Of course the character of a witness is a relevant item. As to Daugherty, it was a damning item. But the testimony of such people is not at all incompetent, and their character, as the New York World pointed out in an editorial on April 24, may be conclusive testimony on the issue of the fitness of a man to be Attorney-General of the United States. If by the witnesses which Senator Wheeler produced he was able to furnish a "living demonstration of the atmosphere which prevailed in and around the Attorney-General of the United States," how possibly could that conclusion have been demonstrated except in the way in which Senator Wheeler demonstrated it? Eminent lawyers might have done it a little differently —but the chances are very strong that they wouldn't have done it at all. It requires pertinacity and high indifference to the winds that blow to drive through the obstacles which faced Senator Wheeler. The performance of such a man in such a situation cannot be finely weighed, by a distant onlooker after the event, on an apothecary's scale. We have clear indications as to how a "better lawyer than Senator Wheeler" would have dealt with the situation. The indications are furnished by the attitude of Senator Pepper; they are furnished by the supine silence of the Bar before Senator Wheeler began, for from the time of his appointment as Attorney-General lawyers widely knew Daugherty's unfitness for the post; they are revealed in the criticisms by the Bar not of Daugherty but of his exposer, after the first flicker of indignation over the disclosures had subsided.

(4) *Revision of Procedure of Congressional Investigations.*—Nothing in the experience of the Walsh and Wheeler investigations reveals the need of changing the process or confining the limits of congressional investigations. The proper scope and methods of procedure appropriate to congressional investigations depend on the conception of the part they play in enabling Congress to discharge its basic duties. This has been nowhere better expressed than by Woodrow Wilson in his Congressional Government:

> It is the proper duty of a representative body to look diligently into every affair of government and to talk much about what it sees. It is meant to be the eyes and the voice, and to embody the wisdom and will of its constituents. Unless Congress have and use every means of acquainting itself with the acts and the disposition of the administrative agents of the government, the country must be helpless to learn how it is being served; and unless Congress both scrutinize these things and sift them by every form of discussion, the country must remain in embarrassing, crippling ignorance of the very affairs which it is most important that it should understand and direct. The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function.

Undoubtedly, the names of people who have done nothing criminal or wrong, or nothing even

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

offending taste perhaps, have been mentioned in connection with these investigations. A number of such instances appeared in connection with "Ned" McLean's name. All those references are pertinent in showing the ramifications of McLean's influence in official Washington. Also, the names of counsel were mentioned who have had dealings with the Department of Justice which were wholly proper. But where so much that the Department of Justice was doing under Daugherty was not innocent, it is highly important that even innocent transactions in the general field of fraud and suspicion be explained in order to separate the sheep from the goats. The question is not whether people's feelings here and there may be hurt, or names "dragged through the mud," as it is called. The real issue is whether the danger of abuses and the actual harm done are so clear and substantial that the grave risks of fettering free congressional inquiry are to be incurred by artificial and technical limitations upon inquiry. Any quantitative and qualitative judgment of what Walsh and Wheeler were up against, what they produced and how they produced it, leaves the experienced and disinterested mind, duly regardful of the investigating duties of Congress, wholly without justification for changing congressional procedure.

It must be remembered that our rules of evidence are but tools for ascertaining the truth, and that these tools vary with the nature of the issues and the nature of the tribunal seeking facts. Specifically, the system of rules of evidence used in trials before juries "are mainly aimed at guarding the jury from the over-weening effect of certain kinds of evidence." That system, as pointed out by Wigmore, "is not applicable by historical precedent, or by sound practical policy" to "inquiries of fact determinable by administrative tribunals." Still less is it applicable to inquiries by congressional committees. Of course the essential decencies must be observed, namely opportunity for cross-examination must be afforded to those who are investigated or to those representing issues under investigation. Despite Daugherty's statement to the contrary, that opportunity has been scrupulously given by the Brookhart committee.

It must be remembered that in various fields there is no legal protection against harm due to unfettered speech. The only safeguards are those secured by social and moral pressure. Thus the immunities enjoyed by judges and legislators for anything said by them as judges and as legislators are founded on deep experience. So also, the abuses of the printing press are not sought to be corrected by legal restriction or censorship in advance because the remedy is worse than the disease. For the same reason, congressional inquiry ought not to be fettered by advance rigidities, because in the light of experience there can be no reasonable doubt that such curtailment would make effective investigation almost impossible.

Our criminal procedure has been constantly under fire by the legal profession, from Chief Justice Taft down, because of its self-defeating technicalities. In a report to the American Bar Association, vigorous demand has recently been made for the liberalization of rules of evidence and procedure in criminal cases. Taken in connection with the proposal to curb the investigating powers of Congress, what is urged, in effect, is that we abandon the technical limitations which have been established to protect men from being sent to jail too readily, but introduce them into a field where they have never been resorted to and where they are wholly out of place, namely, in the exercise of the informing function of Congress.

A good deal must be left to the standards which Congress imposes upon itself and its committees; a good deal must be left to the duty of newspapers to report fairly and not sensationally, and to interpret wisely; a good deal must be left to the good sense of people.

In conclusion, there is no substantial basis for criticism of the investigations conducted by Senator Walsh and Senator Wheeler. Whatever inconveniences may have resulted are inseparable incidents of an essential exertion of governmental power, and to talk about these incidents is to deflect attention from wrong-doing and its sources.

The procedure of congressional investigation should remain as it is. No limitations should be imposed by congressional legislation or standing rules. The power of investigation should be left untrammelled, and the methods and forms of each investigation should be left for determination of Congress and its committees, as each situation arises. The safeguards against abuse and folly are to be looked for in the forces of responsibility which are operating from within Congress, and are generated from without.

FELIX FRANKFURTER.

"Whether the Dark Had Ushered in the Rain"

Whether the dark had ushered in the rain
Or the rain had brought the dark, or you alone
With rain and night in either hand came in,
You came so quietly I have never known.
Was it in that first year—so heavy-long
Ago—with silent latch and whispering
Of dropping eaves, you entered so and flung
The damp hair from your eyes as now you fling
It back no longer, in a certain way—
Or was it from a later, shadowed spring,
The one remembered moment from a day
White-etched against the blurred years' hurrying?
This being all forever that remains
Of you for me out of our nights and rains.

MAXWELL ANDERSON.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Churches and Social Ethics

IT is possible that the historian of the future will regard the steps taken in the last few years by the Christian churches to formulate afresh the Christian attitude towards matters of political and social morality, as one of the most significant of the movements which have emerged from the war. The attempt is not a new one. In England it has a history which runs far back into the complacency of the nineteenth century. But it has gathered a new impetus from the widespread sense of the bankruptcy of many of the conventions on which our prewar civilization was supposed to rest, and the claim which it voices finds today an echo in the minds of an ever widening circle of adherents. Its latest expression in England has been an impressive conference on Christian Politics, Economics and Citizenship held at Birmingham. Preceded by several years of preparatory study by committees composed of persons of very varying shades of opinion, the practical expression of which was a series of weighty reports embracing topics such as International Relations, Industry and Property, and Education, it was probably the most serious and successful attempt yet made in this country to explore the foundations of political and economic relations in the light of Christian teaching.

The significance of a conference lies in the body of conviction behind it. If one compares recent thought on the subject of the relations of Christianity to organized society with the attitude generally prevalent ten years ago, one is struck by two main tendencies. The first is a change in the conception of the sphere of religion; the second is a change in the conception of the nature of social and political problems. In the first place, what may be called mere indifferentism, if it survives as a temper, is not today advanced as a doctrine. About three years ago the Prime Minister of the day rebuked the Anglican bishops for their public utterances on the Irish question and on a crisis in the coal industry, in language which suggested a theory of the relations between church and state reminiscent of those obtaining between the immortal Mr. Collins and Lady Catharine de Burgh. That point of view is increasingly rare among thoughtful laymen who are members of the churches, and rarer still among the clergy. The conception of religion and politics as two compartments of human affairs which cannot collide because—except in certain special fields, such as education—they do not meet, has in England two centuries of history behind it. It is evaporating with quite extraordinary rapidity. What is taking its place is the conviction that if religious teaching excludes from its purview the institutional framework of society, which at once expresses men's moral values and determines their opportunities for spiritual growth, it is abdicating nine-tenths of its kingdom. Christianity involves of its very nature, it is felt, a doctrine of the conduct and relations of human beings in society. Hence the growing demand that the churches should neither avert their eyes from economic and political issues as matters with which religion has no concern, nor content themselves merely with putting their weight behind progressive movements originating in other quarters, but should formulate their own philosophy of political and social relations. The change is momentous, for the most fundamental of all divisions among theories of society is between those which regard the world of human affairs as self-contained, and those which appeal to a supernatural criterion. What is being sought is, in fact, nothing less than a Christian sociology.

This demand for an independent body of teaching with regard to political and social morality derives additional weight from the growing disposition to regard social issues themselves as presenting an ethical, rather than a purely economic, problem. As long as the evils of organized society were regarded as incidental failures in a system commanding general approval, it was not unnatural to resign their treatment to the specialist, while ordinary men concerned themselves with the normal relations of life. But if those normal relations are themselves such as to make periodical breakdowns inevitable—if, for example, the conduct of international affairs is such as to produce a tension between nations which is not occasional but continuous, if the organization of industry evokes general scepticism and resentment quite apart from its periodical collapses—the problem with which society is confronted is obviously different. The expert is not less necessary, for a technical element is involved in all questions of method. But the fundamental question is what plain men conceive to be a tolerable system of relations between human beings, and this is primarily a question of social morality. It is in the approach to the industrial question that the change of venue is most marked. The gravamen of most of the contemporary criticism of the industrial system is strikingly different from what it commonly was as recently as ten years ago. It is not merely that a large number of workers appear to derive a meagre and precarious livelihood from industries which appear to yield a small minority of persons considerable affluence, but that, in its most highly developed and typical forms, it involves a position of privilege among the latter and subordination

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

among the former, repugnant to any ethical doctrine which emphasizes human equality and solidarity.

To one who looks back upon the apparently almost complete indifference to questions of political and social ethics which was the general attitude of the Christian churches at the opening of this century, the change involved in the mere raising of such issues is in itself remarkable. But while criticism of the established order is easy, constructive thought and action are difficult, and the real problem before those concerned in this movement is to develop some permanent organs of enlightenment and guidance out of a ferment of moral dissatisfaction and aspiration. The failure of the churches to bring Christian thought to bear effectively upon social institutions and economic relations and public policy has arisen, not from the fact that their members and leaders were individually set against the light, but that, being accustomed to regard these matters as the concern of other authorities, they omitted to develop the intellectual equipment required for dealing with them. They slid, in fact, at least in England, into a world of close international contacts and an industrial civilization with an organization developed in the main to meet the conditions of a different and less exacting environment. It is as though a state had carried into the twentieth century the political structure, the incompetent and corrupt civil service, the chaotic local government of the eighteenth. Inadequately provided with the personnel and machinery required for creative thought, they have too often been thrust into the position of improvizing opinions in fields where improvization is an absurdity, and of speaking without conviction because they were conscious of speaking without knowledge. The result till recently has been that, with certain conspicuous exceptions, they have followed where they should have led, and that even their occasional utterances have carried less weight than on their merits they deserved, because they appeared to be a belated tribute to ideas which were already on the road to victory.

Luther is said to have remarked that there was no reason why the devil should have all the good tunes. There is equally little reason why the churches should not profit by the experience of other associations to equip themselves with an effective organization for the formulation and expression of Christian thought on matters of political and social ethics. The forms which it will assume will vary, of course, according to their different circumstances and to the conditions of different countries. What is gradually emerging in this country is the demand for a permanent department which may act as a continuous organ of research and centre of educational effort for all such churches as will consent to be connected with it. The result may appear a small one, but its effect would, in reality, be very great. At present when an issue involving large questions of political morality is before the nation, every kind of body makes its voice heard, but the churches, except in rare cases, speak too late or not at all. Every kind of society maintains some machinery for giving it expert advice on the special questions in which it is interested: the churches possess nothing analogous except in the most rudimentary form. Such a department as has been suggested, if effectively staffed and controlled, would enable them at once to enlighten their own members and to intervene in public questions with an authority which they have not hitherto been able to exercise. Nor would the least of its advantages be that it would be a visible symbol of the fact that a church is a corporate society with ethical standards of its own which may differ from those of the world of industry and of the state, and which it is prepared, when necessary, to uphold against them.

London. R. H. TAWNEY.

A Fisher-Shape

Up from the coast a fisher-shape
Entered a busy town;
And she brought a fisher-net to drape
Her village gown.

And part of her folded net would hold
A star-fish, part a star,
And then a bit of deep-sea mould;
You know how such things are.

And boys would trip, where she trailed her net,
In the tangle of her wishes;
And even grown-ups would forget
And think that they were fishes.

She would pull them this way, pull them that,
Up and down the street,
And then would throw the whole catch to a cat
That she happened to meet,

With only the star left in the weave,
A star that from overhead
Had caught in the meshes and never would leave,
Although it was dead.

And so she would sit on a curb and plead
With the dead star not to die,
Because by night she would surely need
Its light for seeing by . . .

And all of a sudden darkness came
All over the place;
But the dead star gave a tiny flame,
Lighting her face.

And not another face to be seen
But hers, and hers was wet
With tears that she was trying to clean
In the holes of a net.

WITTER BYNNER.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Ohio Gang

III. Money Changers in the Temple

THESE lines are being written on a glorious afternoon in early May, beside an open window overlooking a park in Washington, D. C. With these fresh lawns and young leaves before me, my memory goes back to another May afternoon four years ago when I sat in a room in Washington, facing a prospect equally fair, and talked, while the shadows lengthened across the grass, with a senator from Ohio who six months later was to be made President of the United States.

The impression he first made—one confirmed by numerous other interviews—was of an amiable, modest man, with a low emotional boiling point, and an almost neurotic desire to be liked by those around him—a desire so strong that it might easily outweigh the wish, which is often incompatible with it, to be respected. In the fortnight preceding my talk with him, I had traveled 3,000 miles on behalf of a newspaper syndicate, interviewing all the leading presidential candidates of all parties (except Eugene Debs in Atlanta Prison). I remember being struck again, as I had frequently been before, with the similarity between the tribe of politicians and that of actors.

In Warren G. Harding, as in scores of other men elected to important office, I found the handsome, rather florid features which are characteristic of the actor—or the preacher; the (probably meaningless) broad forehead; the large nose; the somewhat irresolute mouth; and above all, the general atmosphere of acute self-consciousness, of forever watching the effect one is making, and of using ideas and deeds only as so many candles to be lighted on the altar of the great god Personality. With it all, there was a certain amount of boyish charm of spontaneity, as when he leaped up, tiptoed to the door and triumphantly pointed through the crack to the unconscious shoulders of a girl stenographer who, he said, had bought herself a $500 fur coat—"That's twice as much, by George, as I can afford to spend on a coat for Mrs. Harding." A few moments later he was propounding with grave earnestness an interpretation of the tariff so utterly fantastic that I asked him to repeat it and then wrote it down verbatim: "The United States should adopt a protective tariff of such a character as will best help the struggling industries *of Europe* to get on their feet."

These little incidents, it seems to me, reveal illuminatingly two chief characteristics of President Harding's mind: his habit of thinking in terms of personalities, and the kindly impulse which lay behind many of his mental processes, no matter how clouded those processes might be. It was once suggested that if the United States could arrange to have two Presidents, one to do the important executive work, and the other to pose for the movies, lay cornerstones, and shake hands, he would have been the perfect candidate for the latter post. I think that judgment is strengthened with the passage of time.

But unluckily this plan is still on paper. From March 4, 1921, until his death at San Francisco on August 2, 1923, Warren G. Harding was President in name and in fact. It is important, I think, that we should seek to understand just what went on in Washington during those twenty-nine months; and particularly how it was made possible in the first place. Let me repeat that the vital public question involved justifies, I think, our ignoring the shadow of death which now lies across those twenty-nine months—especially since a number of disreputable individuals are earnestly seeking to hide themselves behind that shadow.

In the first two articles of the series in which this is the third, I have sketched the origins of the "Ohio gang" which came to Washington in March, 1921. I have pointed out the rise of Harding and Daugherty in particular, within the ranks of the Republican machine organization in Ohio—an organization which during the decades of their connection with it, was as cynical, sordid and corrupt as existed in any state in the Union. I have shown Harding as the ally of the notorious George B. Cox, Cincinnati boss, vote manipulator and exposed grafter, whom the Marion editor, as late as 1904, called "a peerless leader, to whom everyone owes deference and devotion." I have pointed out how Harding was taken in hand by Daugherty in 1912 on behalf of the state machine, then badly in need of window-dressing; and I have told how the Republican party in 1920, sure of its victory, with brazen impudence forced upon the country Daugherty's man. They knew full well that he was one of the least suitable of all the candidates for the nomination. They counted upon his party loyalty, amiability and lack of initiative to insure that he would only be a figurehead. No special secret was made of this intention, which lay behind the phrase about "summoning the counsel of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Best Minds." Washington, at least, knew perfectly well what was planned.

The outlines of the Republican plan and practice have grown increasingly plain to the country during the past few months. The motto of the administration was Business First. While the bribery of Fall lay outside the calculations, the betrayal and looting of our invaluable naval oil reserve was certainly part of the policy. Turning the Department of Justice over to Daugherty for an anti-labor campaign was part of the policy. The use of injunctions in the effort to break strikes was part of the policy. Trumped-up scares over red revolutions, based on manufactured evidence furnished by Burns's bureau, were part of the policy. And in particular, turning out of office every Democrat who could possibly be unseated, good or bad, and replacing him with a Republican, good or bad, was part of the policy.

It has become rather the fashion, I know, to picture President Harding as an innocent victim basely betrayed by men in whom he, with his simple-hearted faith, placed a confidence which they violated. This explanation seems to me much less than the truth. I concede that Mr. Harding was extraordinarily gullible, that when he liked a man he neither inquired too closely into moral character in the beginning, nor accepted, save with the greatest reluctance, subsequent reports of misdoing. But to pretend that he was unaware of what was going on about him is to insult his memory with the supposition that he was a fool.

I do not intend here to go beyond the recorded facts. The Republican political machine did not, for instance, force upon the President Senator Fall as Secretary of the Interior. It was the other way 'round. Harding knew perfectly that his friend Fall in the first place was unfit by character and antecedents to be a Cabinet officer, and in the second place was a notorious foe of the policy of conserving natural resources. Yet the President selected him. Fall's appointment was one of the first to be announced, weeks before the inauguration. Nearly every other Cabinet post was in doubt, but everyone knew that Fall was safe.

Less than three months later, the President had signed the transfer of the oil reserves from the Navy Department to the Department of the Interior. When Senator La Follette protested against this obvious raid upon the public resources, and Fall replied in his own defence, Harding wrote to him:

> My dear Secretary Fall: I am making a belated acknowledgement of yours of April 13, with which you enclose to me a copy of yours of the previous day, addressed to the Senior Senator from Wisconsin. I quite approve of the manner in which you responded to his inquiry.

Long after La Follette had made his first great speech in the Senate attacking the leases on grounds of public policy and citing testimony of oil geologists to show that no such necessity existed for removing the oil as Fall had alleged, the President wrote to the President of the Senate (Mr. Coolidge) transmitting a statement of the Secretary of the Interior in defence of the oil leases and adding:

> I think it is only fair to say in this connection that the policy which has been adopted by the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior in dealing with these matters was submitted to me prior to the adoption thereof and the policy decided upon and the subsequent acts have at all times had my entire approval.

Similarly, the appointment of Daugherty as Attorney-General was Harding's own act, and was not forced upon him by the Republican machine, though it quite approved of the subsequent general policies I have mentioned. Indeed, the records indicate considerable opposition to the selection, as well there might have been, since Mr. Daugherty's gross incompetence and undesirability were almost as plain in 1921 as they are today. Those who wondered at this extraordinary appointment understand it better now. They realize that Harding was Daugherty's man, and that the latter, as his political sponsor in Ohio, was able to write his own ticket.

There are other appointments which must be laid at the door of the President himself, and not that of the machine which he served. Some of these are reasonably innocent, and some are not. Space permits no more than a brief enumeration of some conspicuous ones.

There is the case, for example, of the Rev. Heber Votaw. Mr. Votaw married the future President's sister, Miss Carolyn Harding, in 1903. In the following year he went to Burma, where he spent a decade as a missionary. Returning to this country in 1914, when his brother-in-law was elected to the Senate, he presently turns up as a clerk in Mr. Harding's office. One month and two days after the inauguration, he was given the important and exacting post of superintendent of federal prisons. Thereafter, he disappeared from public view until a few weeks ago when testimony was given before a Senate committee alleging that during his administration the smuggling of drugs to federal prisoners had increased to scandalous proportions. On April 4, 1924, it may be remembered, W. J. Burns testified that an investigation by his men of the smuggling of drugs into Atlanta Prison had been called off at the order of Mr. Votaw, just at the moment when the trail was leading to the "men higher up" who were responsible for this traffic.

There is the case of E. Mont Reily, who was a member of the Ohio gang not by birth or marriage, but by natural affinity. Mr. Reily hails

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from Kansas City, where he was in the mortgage loan business. He claims to have been the original Theodore Roosevelt man; not until his hero died did he become, in January, 1918, the original Harding man. (It would be interesting to know whose original man Mr. Reily became in August, 1923!) He was appointed Governor of Porto Rico in July, 1921, and made a magnificent mess of his administration of affairs there. The details, fairly well aired at the time, need not be repeated here. His record was so bad that even his faithful friend in the White House could not save him from dismissal.

There is the case of A. D. Lasker, of Chicago, also one of Harding's personal appointees. Lasker, head of a big advertising agency, a man whose only prior contact with ocean shipping had been attained in the interval between walking up and walking down the gangplank of a liner bound for Europe, was appointed by Harding to head the Shipping Board, and to seek to solve the problem of America's three and a half billion dollar fleet, built and administered to the accompaniment of one of the most shameful stories of waste and corruption in American history. Without attempting to go into the details of the Lasker policies, it should be observed that the Chicago advertising man proved as inept politically as he was ignorant of the problems of maritime transportation. He promptly advocated, and persuaded the President to support, a ship subsidy proposal which if passed would have placed in the hands of the Shipping Board's head (Mr. Lasker or some successor) powers far greater and more autocratic in character than those exercised by the President himself. To have passed such a bill would have been a national misfortune. Luckily it failed, and Mr. Lasker soon thereafter retired to Chicago.

There is the case of D. R. Crissinger, the Marion attorney and friend of Mr. Harding whom he made Comptroller of the Currency less than a fortnight after the inauguration. I do not argue that the Comptroller ought to be a banker; but it is at least amusing to note that Mr. Crissinger's first executive connection with any bank apparently began on September 5, 1920, when he was elected to the proud office of President of the National City Bank and Trust Company, of Marion, Ohio.

There is the case of Elmer Dover, for whom the responsibility must be shared between President Harding and the Republican organization of which he was a member. Dover, a hard-boiled Republican politician from Ohio, who in his younger days had been secretary to Mark Hanna, was made Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in December, 1921. Everyone in Washington knew the purpose of this appointment. The political machine lives on the loyalty of the rank and file; and the rank and file are kept in line with jobs. The Treasury Department has always been a favorite hunting ground for patronage dispensers; and particularly since the prohibition enforcement unit grew to such huge proportions. Mr. Dover was given his job for the purpose of throwing out all the Democrats on the Treasury Department payroll and putting in Republicans. As for the qualifications of the individuals concerned—what is a little matter like qualifications between fellow Republicans?

But Dover ran against a snag. The Democrats had been in office for eight years; and had developed in that time a number of men highly expert in the administration of the Treasury's often complicated and delicate routine. The Department possessed one man who was keenly concerned for its welfare—D. H. Blair, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Blair was so oddly blind that he could see no reason why an experienced, efficient man, just because he happened to be a Democrat, should be replaced by an inexperienced, inefficient one just because he happened to be a Republican. Blair protested the Dover policies; whereupon the Republican politicians announced that Blair Would Have To Go. Blair took the matter to Secretary Mellon who, as a business man, has hankerings for efficient operation. The Secretary promptly took it to Harding and presented an ultimatum: either Blair stayed or Mellon went. The President stuck by Mr. Mellon; and Blair is there yet.

There is the case, more innocent than some of the others, but deserving to be recorded in any comprehensive list, of Mr. Harding's selection of Doctor C. E. Sawyer, head of the Sawyer Sanitarium at Marion, to be his personal physician and a Brigadier General. Dr. Sawyer's perhaps well-meant but extremely unfortunate interference in the political aspects of the Veterans' Bureau is too well known to need to be recalled here.

There is the case of George Harvey, Ambassador to the Court of St. James's—a case which needs no lily-gilding by anyone.

Of the three most undesirable appointments of the Harding administration I have thus far mentioned only two—Fall and Daugherty. The third, that of Charles R. Forbes as head of the Veterans' Bureau was perhaps worst of all, and most typical both of Harding's mistaken judgment and of the unhealthy atmosphere of the whole executive branch. During Forbes's time in office more than $225,000,000 a year went in graft and waste—or about two-thirds as much as the government's present total annual surplus. The astonishing record of Forbes will be discussed in a subsequent article.

BRUCE BLIVEN.

(Note: This is the third in a series of articles of which the fourth will appear in an early issue.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Behind the Wheels

THE mechanistic age and I had always had a quarrel. The age had seemed to say that with it had ended a kind of personal ingenuity, the painful and passionate labor of the old craftsman. The age seemed to say that wheels and organizations had taken the place of this. And I suspected they had not.

True, all about me the wheels ran smoothly—wheels under me in the subway, wheels above me in the elevator loft, wheels beyond my window at any point of the compass, purring in mine shaft, factory, pumping plant. Nobody seemed to do more than press buttons to start and stop wheels. Nobody seemed to rise at five and sweat until midnight. If your gas leaked or your light fuse burned out, the emergency man, strolling with a contemptuous leisure from emergency to emergency, came in to fix it. The wheels had seemingly made art and devotion in labor unnecessary. They had distributed an eight-hour day and a pressing of buttons all around, and the world was different.

I repeat, I suspected that this was not so. Then I met Hackbolt, and I knew it was not.

I met Hackbolt after I had moved beyond the subways and the elevators into the outer fringe of Suburbia, and had bought an $85 car and kept it at the Garage-at-the-Station.

The Garage-at-the-Station maintained by implication that the wheels were right. It was wheels itself. It agreed to harbor my $85 car with some misgiving—I got the impression that I should have bought a new automobile of a more expensive make, or at least a more pretentious second-hand one. For in buying a car, the Garage implied, I had come actively into the world of wheels, and wheels, after all, should be good ones. Still, the Garage-at-the-Station agreed to keep my car for me, and cheerfully did its best to show me that, once the flivver was successfully cranked, life was just pressing buttons.

Unfortunately I discovered that with an $85 car this was not true. Things happened. The engine was all right after the carbon had been cleaned out, and the steering gear was satisfactory after a part or two had been straightened. With a battery to furnish an especially fat spark the car would start when the temperature was above fifty-five degrees, and after the broken front and back springs had been replaced by sound ones, I had confidence that the body would not again settle down on the rear axle. (I must admit that it rode for five miles in this unusual position, and was still functioning when the Garage-at-the-Station discovered what had happened.) Still, the engine casing leaked sporadically and the carburetor leaked continuously, and one of the "shoes" kept pulling its valve stem askew. The lights connection jarred loose and the horn became silent.

The Garage-at-the-Station wrestled earnestly with these difficulties, but I could see it regarded them as unusual and only temporarily remediable. It didn't seem even to understand them, and apparently had to study them out. For instance, there was a bill of an hour's time for restoring the voice of the horn, and the voice didn't last. I had to get a new horn. The Garage-at-the-Station remarked on this occasion: "Some day I'll have to sell you a *real* car," and despite its smile I felt a coldness in the region of the heart and an anticipatory lightness in that of the pocketbook.

I was greatly disturbed. Obviously (*I* knew, although the Garage did not) there could be no car for me but the one I had. To be sure, it was a rather poor thing; still it was all I could afford, and it was necessary to my goings and comings. I knew others who used cars little better or even worse.

After certain improvements I had made, it was really a $125 car.

And all this being true, the world was not running smoothly. I had a premonition that there was more to it—discouragingly more—than pressing buttons.

There was. One afternoon when I had come out early there was a skipping and backfiring as I went up a small hill, and the car stopped. It would respond to cranking only with coughs. Almost piously thankful that this had happened on the way from the station instead of on the way to it, I accepted a kindly lift back to town, passed the Garage-at-the-Station, and went on to Hackbolt's.

The truth is that I had been feeling the necessity for this trip for some time. I knew Hackbolt. Once a week he delivered groceries along my road for his father. My road was four miles from town, but a Hackbolt had delivered groceries there for twenty years, and while he himself ran a garage he felt an obligation to see that the process continued as long as his father kept a store. Still, he admitted that the important fact about *him* was his amazing intimacy with automobiles. He could knock down a sick car and put it together again while the owner went for his mail. And it was a shame I had paid $85 for that flivver without a top or a self-starter. If he had known I wanted a car, he could have sold me a pretty good runabout with all the trimmings for only $75.

This I took as a man does, but the neighbor's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

boy had said, on one trying occasion, "Why don't you take it to Hackbolt?" with a finality that had shaken me.

So, in the end, I took it to him.

Hackbolt was a great deal like his name, which used to be German, but isn't any more. His father spoke with a faint accent, but Hackbolt himself was in voice, appearance, manner, and method a Yankee. When I told him what had happened he remarked:

"Well, mister, you probably got something the matter with your timer. I don't say that for sure, but it's my guess. Let's take the truck and go and see."

We jangled out our mile and a half, Hackbolt put a deft hand into the darkness at the front of the engine, extracted the timer (I was continually discovering these new parts I had not even had time to read about in the Manual) tinkered mysteriously with it, put back the hood, contemptuously ignored the battery and started the car on "Mag" with a single little hitch, and remarked in a summarizing manner:

"Ye-eh."

Then he gave me his professional advice.

"That timer won't last you forever, and you could have a new one put in for two and a half if you wanted to. Still, she may run on into next season, and then probably she won't stop dead on you. That's what I like about a flivver—no matter how bad it is a man don't have to tow it to a garage. No (and he looked at me pointedly) a man ought always to be able to get into the garage with a flivver."

Somewhat intimidated, I explained about the engine casing and the leaking carburetor. If I took the car back, would he fix them? Would he look it over generally?

"Why, yes, mister, we will," he replied. "Yeh, bring her in and I'll see what I can do for you."

It is not necessary to describe in detail what he did. But, in brief, he recleaned the engine and supplied it with a new gasket so it ceased to leak, he took the carburetor apart and so put it together that the leakage (which the Garage-at-the-Station had fought vainly for months) miraculously stopped. He adjusted the clutch and made the transmission brake work. He located and eliminated three or four mysterious rattles. All this he performed in about an hour. I watched him, wondering if the bill would be fifteen or twenty dollars. He said when I asked him:

"Why, that's two dollars for the trip, and fifty, eighty, and the time is—two dollars for repairs—just four dollars, mister."

This, of course, seemed a kind of miracle to me. It was all in contrast to what I had learned about wheels from the Garage-at-the-Station. At Hackbolt's an old car apparently had a just place in life. Its defects were not remedied by selling me brand new expensive parts. And while Hackbolt seemed to watch and touch a car with all the sense and genius of the specialist, he seemed to hold his time and labor in modest regard.

Furthermore, the flivver, having been touched by him, ceased to betray me with petty breakdowns. Its looks were not in the least improved, but it ran.

Yet I discovered that in spite of his remarkable characteristics, Hackbolt fitted easily into the universe. He was even taken for granted. He was roused out of bed at five in the morning and might have to stay up until twelve at night. He balked at nothing—a $20,000 touring car, an adding machine, a bit of intricate mill machinery, a topless chassis some high school boy had put in motion—all were one to Hackbolt. He had married and his wife had left him, and he was contemplating marriage again. Occasionally, of a Sunday, if I took the road, I would see him flash by in a new car, a fur-lined coat, and a gorgeous smile. But on the whole he stuck closely to his red "garage," his hands black, his face grease-smeared, his loud, rather high voice laying down the law as to bearings, spark plugs, the merits of respective automobiles, or the probabilities of life in some defective mechanical agent he had done his best to recreate.

Gradually I came to see who he was. Obviously, he was the man who made the illusion of wheels possible. Ultimately the modern universe, if it groaned or wheezed or jammed, was turned over to Hackbolt for repairs. The newer part of it, of course, ran on pretty much by itself, with relatively ignorant and perfunctory attendants such as the Garge-at-the-Station furnished. These polished and replaced and furnished anew. But the great working world of wheels came rolling up to Hackbolt's door for help.

And he helped it. I sometimes sighed as I saw the ugliness on which his time and ingenuity were wasted, but there was no question of his talent. According to modern dogma the skilled workman has gone. Anyone who has known Hackbolt will suspect that he has merely undergone a kind of a social change. Your woodworkers, your smiths, your old-fashioned carpenters and cabinet-makers —none of them can outdo Hackbolt in diligence or craft. Theirs may have been a lovelier lot. Hackbolt can only save you work or give you speed—he cannot supply beauty. But he does what his world asks and does it perfectly. Perhaps this is enough. I am sure the pressing of buttons and the moving of levers would not do without him. Knowing that Hackbolt exists, I can have confidence in these things, although I feel also the satisfaction of having penetrated a certain pretense of super-human sufficiency which I had always resented in them.

FRANK ERNEST HILL.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Page of Sonnets

"If the Lord Would Make Windows in Heaven"

She who had eyes but had not wherewithal
To see that he was doomed to his own way,
Dishonored his illusions day by day,
And year by year was more angelical.
Flaunting an injured instinct for the small,
She stifled always more than she would say;
Nursing a fear too futile to betray,
She sewed, and waited for the roof to fall.

A seer at home, she saw that his high lights
That were not shining, and were not afire,
Were such as never would be seen from there;
A saint abroad, she saw him on the heights,
And feared for him—who, if he went much higher,
Might one day not be seen from anywhere.

EDWIN ARLINGTON ROBINSON.

A Gull Goes Up

Gulls when they fly move in a liquid arc;
Still head; and wings that bend above the breast,
Covering its glitter with a cloak of dark,
Gulls fly; so would at last toward balm and rest,
Remembering wings, the desperate leave their earth,
Bear from their earth what there was ruinous-crossed,
Peace from distress, and love from nothing-worth,
Fast at the heart, its jewels of dear cost.

Gulls go up hushed to that entrancing flight,
With never a feather of all the body stirred;
So in an air less rare than longing might
The dream of flying lift a marble bird.
Desire it is that flies; then wings are freight,
That only bear the feathered heart no weight.

LÉONIE ADAMS.

Tide Line

Here is the tide-line—higher than this mark
The kelp lies withered and another realm
Has its frontiers. The pines lean over dark
Sea-grottoes irrepressible oceans whelm.
Incurious eyes peer up at us through skies
No wing has clouded; hidden from the sun,
New countries are conceived; a builder dies
And leaves his little coral house undone.

Yet we stand firm in our appointed place,
Reading no secrets where the noonday burns.
The winds of earth are good, and we have space
To move and breathe. Our living Faith returns
To these gnarled pines, though at their roots may course
Untasted waters, bitter at the source.

LESLIE NELSON JENNINGS.

X-Ray

Smile if you will or frown, wear silk or serge,
Play Age or Youth, it will not help, my dear.
This is a place where Truth is made too clear
For idle minds to watch that Truth emerge.
The penetration of this light is just,
Inhuman, and most mercilessly pure.
From its assault upon your house of dust,
Only the naked scaffold will endure.

Beneath the perfect candor of this ray
All transient comeliness lies overthrown,
And even human blood is only gray,
And ribs and joints are beautiful alone,
As the weak flesh contests, but cannot stay
The passionless search for the unyielding bone.

STEPHEN VINCENT BENÉT.

On a Drunken Painter Who Repeats the Same Canvas Eternally

The wasted form now part of Time's delight,
The crumbling brain ill-shapen by the potter's
Contemptuous skill, the soul that habit slaughters,
The shaking hands that lift the cup by night
Encouraging oblivion, and the slight
Endurance of brief talent that still totters,
A living dead thing on a waste of waters
Where broken moons lie quivering and white.

Now nothing but an old dream long repeated
Till repetition drained the least of life
Remains to show an urge so oft repeated
That it no longer cuts him like a knife,
Who in a legendary long ago
Shook hands with Tintoret and Angelo.

HERBERT S. GORMAN.

So Passes the Glory

Do not believe this autumn earth will last;
Those fires of bronze and chrome burn clear and still,
But some blue dawn will touch them on the hill,
Cold against flame, and flame will wither fast.
Do not believe the earth of rose and white
Can keep its breath or bloom beyond a day;
There will be rain, and softer stars, and play
Of warm-lipped winds deflowering in the night.

Magic comes shining with impending doom,
Crying, "Be swift!" and so is burned away.
Clutch, if you can, the light upon the gloom,
Flashing no longer than a take of breath.
Do not believe its sudden gleam will stay;
Do not believe in life by doubting death.

FRANK ERNEST HILL.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

The Press and Mr. Murphy

SIR: In your issue of May 7 you say "We are a little sickened to find an honorable and intelligent newspaper like the New York World devoting two pages of news space and a long, leading editorial to a grave discussion of the 'career' of the late Charles F. Murphy, leader of Tammany Hall." The implication of that sentence and the editorial which followed is that American newspapers, including the New York World, are conspiring to convince the world that Charles F. Murphy was a great, fine and noble statesman. The editorial, combined a perfectly just criticism of Mr. Murphy's record and a backhanded slap at the American press.

The American daily press, like the American weekly press, has its faults, but in our opinion the least of the faults of the daily is the underplaying or overplaying of news. It is fairly well established what constitutes news to the American public. The New York World, like thousands of papers throughout the country, concerns itself not with what the people ought to want, but what they do want. People are interested in personalities. Charles F. Murphy was a personality—a unique personality and the representative of an absolutely unique American institution, the political machine. He was not only the head of the greatest political machine in America, he was the American political boss incarnate—a creature profoundly interesting to millions of people, even if not wholly and completely admirable. If the political machine is a power for good, it is interesting; if it is a power for evil, it is surely no less interesting. Any man who wields great power, whether for good or for evil, is News, and a newspaper can and should treat him as such whether or not it holds a brief either for or against him.

In addition to this, a political convention is approaching, in which Mr. Murphy undoubtedly would have had a large, not to say dominating, influence. Opposing party forces will be bitterly arrayed. The presidential candidacy of Governor Al Smith rested largely on Mr. Murphy's leadership. It probably is the opinion of the New Republic that Al Smith, like Calvin Coolidge, would be undesirable as a President, but that fact makes his candidacy none the less important. If Al Smith were to be nominated the country would witness a revolutionary experiment on the part of the Democratic party. In previous campaigns the party has placed its confidence in the solid south. The question as to whether the solid south would remain solid in the face of a wet Catholic's candidacy, is an absorbing one. Therefore, the solid south has had its eyes on Mr. Murphy.

Furthermore, Al Smith, as Mr. McAdoo's chief competitor for the nomination, is an arresting subject for the followers of Mr. McAdoo. And thus Mr. Murphy, Governor Smith's helmsman, may fairly be said to have been a person of considerable importance as far as the political world was concerned.

In view of these facts it is reasonable to suppose that several millions of people were more or less deeply interested in the facts concerning Mr. Murphy's life and his climb to power. The circulation books of the New York World will show that the World at least knows a news story when it sees it. . . . We agree perfectly with the New Republic's criticism of Mr. Murphy; but the New Republic's unjustified slur on American newspapers is unworthy of a journal which represents a growing factor in American life. The New York World although avowedly liberal, was fair enough to recognize the fact that Mr. Murphy's life and death were matters of considerable importance to the nation: the New Republic was not.

GORDON R. COBBLEDICK,
BRUCE CATTON.

Cleveland, Ohio.

[These correspondents have confused two issues and have thus done an injustice to our editorial paragraph to which they refer. The New Republic amply recognizes the fact that Mr. Murphy's death was an important news event, justifying extensive space and large headlines. What we objected to was not the amount of space devoted to Mr. Murphy but the character of the comment on him. That comment, we believed and still believe, treated the facts of Mr. Murphy's career with a respect to which they were not entitled. The World's editorial spoke of him as "a man of less rugged personal force than Croker, but gifted with a superior mental endowment," and went on to say "He continued throughout his career to manifest the possession of a political judgment usually accurate and well balanced. . . . A leader like Murphy can grow from unpromising beginnings . . . into a better sense of public responsibility. . . . In his field as a city political leader Murphy was the most famous and the most successful. . . . Murphy was a boss . . . but as bosses go he was by no means the worst. In many aspects of his character, in many manifestations of his more recent activities he was a man against whom his political opponents could level no severe condemnation; one who gained the respect and confidence of his supporters . . ." Anyone who will read the entire article from which we have quoted must admit that the sentences given here are fair and representative of its tone. We still maintain that an article such as this is too remote from reality to deserve a place in the editorial columns of such an honorable and intelligent paper as the New York World. We venture to say that there is not a political writer on the staff of that paper who in private conversation would not make an appraisal of Murphy widely dissimilar from the one published. The fact that people are interested in a boss like Murphy, while it justifies the use of extensive space, by no means justifies a description in terms of statesmanship of a man who, while his practices were a little modified to suit the changing public temper of the times, was after all a blood brother of Tweed, Croker, and George B. Cox.—THE EDITORS.]

Professor Schmitt Protests

SIR: In his controversy in your columns with Professors Hazen and Turner about the origins of the late war, Professor Harry E. Barnes referred to me, along with half a dozen others, as a possible arbiter in the debate. I have no desire to become involved in the dispute, but when in his last letter, in the issue of May 7, Professor Barnes invites attention to his article in the May Current History and claims that a recent article by myself takes "the same general position," I beg to protest. Although I am grateful for his complimentary words about my article and am sensible of the honor he has done me by quoting extensively from it in his own article, I feel bound to say that, in my opinion, there are too many differences in our views, both on points of detail and in general conclusions, to warrant his belief that my position is substantially the same as his own.

BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT.

Cleveland, Ohio.

Professor Barnes Replies

SIR: My statement about the general similarity in viewpoint between Professor Schmitt and myself was meant to imply only mutual adherence to the revisionist standpoint as against the position of Hazen and Turner. I might, however, have claimed something far more specific. After reading my Current History article in rough draft Professor Schmitt wrote me in his accompanying letter that "While I have criticized some of your statements, we are not far apart in our general position." After this was written I revised my article in the light of the manuscript of Professor Schmitt's article and of a score of marginal suggestions he made on my manuscript. In fact, I utilized every one of his suggestions except where it seemed perfectly apparent to me from the documents that the facts were as I had stated. If "we were not far apart" originally, it would seem that we could not have been more divergent after I had taken cognizance of his criticisms. Probably the best solution of the controversy is to invite those interested to read both

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

articles and draw their own conclusions on the matter. As an example of historical methodology, however, I would like to invite readers to compare the entire contents of telegram 210 as given on page 53 of the Falsifications of the Russian Orange-Book (Huebsch) with the implied interpretation given by Professor Schmitt in the opening sentence of footnote 140 of his article.

HARRY E. BARNES.

Northampton, Massachusetts.

What Happened at Evanston

SIR: The editorial comment, in your issue of April 9, concerning the recent recrudescence of war-mania in the polite purlieus of Evanston and the jazz columns of the Chicago newspapers, is so admirable in spirit and sound in the moral which it points, and so correct in its diagnosis of the mental condition and astigmatism of "Wigmore, Hopkins, Gorby and Meredith," that it is an unwelcome duty to call your attention to several minor misstatements of fact in your account—due, no doubt, to your dependence for information, in large part, on the Chicago Tribune and the Herald-Examiner, which indulged, on that occasion, in a wanton reportorial spree.

Your account of the meeting of the Epworth League, in the First Methodist Episcopal Church, on Sunday evening, March 23, was substantially correct. The legionnaires who invaded that meeting did not, however, jeer or heckle the speakers. The addresses were concluded without interruption, save for occasional applause, but during the questions that followed there was some excitement, occasioned by the disposition of the legionnaires to make speeches instead of interrogations. In order to prevent this, the chairman closed the meeting. Upon conclusion of Dr. Tittle's benediction, Captain Gorby assumed the platform and treated the departing audience to a declamation of belligerent Americanism, of the type commonly released at old-fashioned Fourth of July celebrations, in which there was obviously more heat than light. By way of lending emphasis and color to his remarks, he called loudly for "some flags on this platform" and, before they could be brought (there was some hitch on the part of the property-man, at this point) a legionnaire called from the rear of the hall, "You won't find any in this church!" That insult to the church, as it was intended and received, caused the hissing, and that alone. Before it had subsided, the poor, innocent, much abused Star Spangled Banner was rushed to the platform, by the legionnaire, where it hung limply against a chair while the oratory proceeded.

It was not the sceptical Captain Hopkins, of the Military Intelligence Department, U. S. A., but an unidentified legionnaire who delivered himself with naïve earnestness of the impressive adage: "The United States never has fought any but righteous wars!"—a remark which tickled rather than offended the audience. The captain contented himself with challenging my casual observation, at the end of my talk, that "even the American government is making elaborate preparations for the next war and for mobilizing the industries of the country within the space of a few days." When I quoted dispatches published in the Chicago Tribune, as one of the erudite and unimpeachable sources of information for this alarming statement, he still seemed unconvinced.

BRENT DOW ALLINSON.

Ravinia, Illinois.

Distinguishing Divinity and Deity

SIR: Believing whatever the sympathies of your journal may be that the patronage of subscribers of the Catholic faith is respected, and their feelings considered, I beg space for the following words in defence of their position in the present controversy on the Virgin-birth.

In his article entitled Conscience and the Bishops, Professor Dickinson Miller says:

> The Pastoral Letter has precipitated a necessity for plain speaking under which we can no longer courteously cloak the fact that no thoroughly educated man believes in the literal Virgin-birth—though many men do so whose spiritual life, ability and efficiency command our admiration. By education I do not mean learning, but the possession of a competent common sense training in judging of ordinary matters of evidence.

Does Professor Miller believe that no educated man of common sense believes in the literal *Incarnation*? Does he believe in it? Can a man of common sense accept the credibility of the literal Incarnation and doubt the credibility of the literal Virgin-birth? Does not the greater miracle include the less? Is it common sense to strain at the gnat and swallow the camel? Men of common sense who accept the credibility of the literal Incarnation find it necessary by reason of their common sense to accept the credibility of the literal Virgin-birth. The only way to doubt the credibility of the latter is to doubt the credibility of the former. This Professor Miller seems to do. Touching the literal Incarnation, he says:

> To say in the creed that he [Jesus] was "conceived by the Holy Spirit, born of the Virgin Mary," that he was the Son of God and also of man, is, for many of us, to use a historic and poetic symbol to express the truth that while he had all the nature of the children of men he was divine in nature in that he was peculiarly one with the spirit of God.

This obviously is not a belief in the literal Incarnation, but in a symbolic incarnation. It makes the Incarnation, metaphor —not fact.

What Professor Miller says he believes in is the divinity of Jesus; what the Catholic church demands is the Deity of Jesus. What Professor Miller believes is that Jesus was peculiarly one with the spirit of God; what the Catholic church requires is that Jesus Christ was very God of very God. What Professor Miller believes is pantheism, immanence, or apotheosis; what the Catholic church requires is Incarnation. What Professor Miller professes is Unitarianism; what the Catholic church professes is Trinitarianism. What Professor Miller sees in Jesus is a man to reverence; what the Catholic church sees, is God-head to worship.

Catholics, Roman, Anglican and Eastern, insist on the credibility of the Virgin-birth not merely because it has been generally believed by Catholic Christianity, but because as a fact it is congruous with the fact of the Incarnation, and because it is literally recorded in two Gospels. To deny it would involve, potentially, the denial of the entire Gospel content and the destruction of all Catholic belief. They freely admit that the Incarnation in the omnipotence of God might have been physically accomplished in some other way than that recorded by St. Matthew and St. Luke, but that way has been revealed in the Gospels as *the* way, and postulating the stupendous fact of the Incarnation, it is to them as men of common sense, a credible way.

If for the belief in the literal Incarnation there is substituted merely Professor Miller's belief "that Jesus was divine in nature in that he was peculiarly one with the Spirit of God," then of course the literal Virgin-birth may be held incredible.

If a belief in the divinity of Jesus "as peculiarly one with the Spirit of God" is to be equivalent in the Catholic church to belief in him as very God of very God, the Catholic church is at an end. If Jesus is not very God of very God, it is certainly time that the Catholic church were at an end, the Bishops at Dallas flatly repudiated, and Modernist consciences comfortably housed in a universal Unitarian church.

CHARLES C. MARSHALL.

New York City.

The Honfleur Conference, 1924

SIR: The second session of the Honfleur Conference, under the auspices of the Society of Friends, will be held this year from August 3 to August 17, in the same place and following the same general program as last year's conference. There will be courses of study in modern history, sociology and economics, and lecture courses by Norman Angell, Sir George Paish, Jean Longuet and others.

Honfleur, a town of unusual interest and beauty, is reached in thirty minutes by daily boat from Havre. There is a good bathing beach and there are excellent tennis courts.

Tickets of admission may be had by mail on application to the European secretary, Tryce Baumgartner, Rothay Holme, Ambleside, Westmoreland, England, if application is made before July 1, or at Conference Headquarters, Pavillon N. D. de Grace, Honfleur after August 1. The price is the equivalent of ten dollars in American money, eight dollars for Europeans because of the exchange. Admission may also be secured for single lectures.

MARY KELSEY,
Executive Secretary.

Short Hills, New Jersey.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Firbank's Light Touch

Prancing Nigger, by Ronald Firbank. New York: Brentano's. $2.00.

"SPEAKING for myself," writes Mr. Carl Van Vechten in his preface to Prancing Nigger, "I may say that I have discovered only one authentic master of the light touch . . . this man is Ronald Firbank. His touch is so light, indeed, that after reading one of his books, I find even Max Beerbohm a trifle studied, a little composed. Confronted by Prancing Nigger, Aldous Huxley might almost be regarded as an earnest fellow."

It is true that Mr. Firbank has a light touch; but I am not sure that Mr. Van Vechten gives quite an accurate account of him. Mr. Firbank's novels, though certainly anything but "realistic," are in a sense very close to life. They are too actual to have the lightness of fantasy. They are really not woven of moonbeams like, say, the novels of Mr. Cabell, but stitched together with great pains from the precious scraps of experience. For Mr. Firbank has a sharp observation which falls frequently into very much the vein of France's Histoire Contemporaine. His landscapes seem inspired by real landscapes; his social atmospheres studied from real people; and his dialogue a skimming off of a certain film of raciness and drollness from actual conversation. He has far more taste for the actual flavor, even the rank flavor, of life than most of the writers of the Yellow Book period to whose school he essentially belongs.

Before I had read Mr. Firbank's novel on the subject, I had never felt the life of the West Indies so vividly brought before me—even to breathing its hot blue nights and hearing its careless voices—as in a single snatch of native Negro song from Martinique:

> Tant sirop est doux, Madelein',
> Tant sirop est doux.
> Ne criez pas si fort, Madelein',
> Ne criez pas si fort, Madelein'!
> La maison n'est pas à nous, Madelein',
> La maison n'est pas à nous.

Now it is in catching (and inventing) just such snatches of song, and shreds of talk and glimpses of things seen, that Mr. Firbank has succeeded in recreating the West Indies of Prancing Nigger—just as in The Princess Zeubaroff he communicated the accent of Florence, or in The Flower Beneath the Foot of the little Central European court. So he catches the "Cunan" bars, for example:

> Costa Rica, Chile Bar. To the Island of June. . . .
> Red roses, against tall mirrors, reflecting the falling night.
> Seated before a cloudy cocktail, a girl with gold cheeks like the flesh of peaches, addressed him softly from behind: "Listen, lion!"
> But he merely smiled on himself in the polished mirror, displaying moist-gleaming teeth and coral gums.
> An aroma of aromatic cloves . . . a mystic murmur of ice.

Thus it is not by reason of a lighter touch that Firbank surpasses Aldous Huxley and Max Beerbohm but through his superior artistic seriousness. It is this authenticity combined with strangeness which affords us the peculiar satisfaction we derive from him at his best—the satisfaction in the intensely and personally felt world of the first-rate artist.

But I must draw rein before I succeed in creating an impression as misleading in one direction as Mr. Van Vechten's is perhaps in the other. For all Mr. Firbank's uncommon gifts, he is somehow unsatisfactory. "Make no mistake," Mr. Van Vechten assures us, "what he wants to do, he does, and is a master of the doing of." But does Mr. Firbank really know, I begin to ask myself, what it is he wants to do? When he is not writing charmingly and finely, he is only making silly jokes. When his characters are not admirable comic personages, they have a way of becoming comic supplement people—(though I will say that Prancing Nigger is one of the best sustained of his novels that I have read). And there is a persistent bitterness at the bottom of his books which cannot live in the same house with the "gags" and which is always protruding through the fantasy like the spikes on the convent wall that Laura beats her hands against in the last page of The Flower Beneath the Foot. The high pitch of imagination which he reaches at his best does not belong with the kind of nonsense, I mean the kind of *unimaginative* nonsense, which he is given to writing at his worst. His chief themes are disappointed love and distressing humiliation; but when he illustrates these themes—along with his extravagant repertory of vices—with characters which are burlesque without taking actual body, the ugliness of the joke is likely to be the only thing that strikes us. For this reason, Valmouth is a hideous book and as little "Greek"—Mr. Van Vechten claims that Firbank is Greek—as Wycherley's Plain Dealer.

For there is some queer maladjustment in Firbank which prevents his reaching full artistic reality—some deficiency of imagination which is always making him go blank. He seems to be preparing marvelous scenes and then the scenes are never brought off: he evades the problem by presenting minor scenes on the periphery of the central action. Nor do these minor scenes always have the same effective indirect bearing on the subject as the scenes in the Histoire Contemporaine, which they seem to imitate. Furthermore, though Mr. Firbank easily takes rank as the most habitually "suggestive" living writer, he too often succeeds in suggesting nothing beyond abstract indecent ideas: one would prefer him to be a little more sensual and a little less ingenious. The result of all this is that the reader is baffled; but not, I believe, as Mr. Van Vechten supposes, because bafflement is Mr. Firbank's aim.

It is as if there were something rankling in Ronald Firbank, like the discordant melancholy of Mr. Mouth among the gaieties of the Mouth family. While Mrs. Mouth and her daughters are bustling about their amorous and social triumphs, Mr. Mouth sits morosely by and, as if in prophetic vision of their disaster, says merely, "Lemme alone. Ah'm thinkin' ". . . Mr. Van Vechten, who admires the light touch and is so eager to find someone who has it, has, I am afraid, been betrayed by his favorite. Mr. Firbank has been thinking and it has made him unhappy.

Among the orchids which Madame Ruiz kept in her magnificent conservatory was the Ronald Firbank, "a dingy lilac blossom of rarity untold." Well, one must admit the rarity at worst—and that is a good deal for an English novelist.

EDMUND WILSON.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Goslings

The Goslings, by Upton Sinclair. Pasadena: Published by the Author. $2.00.

IT was inevitable that this book, or one much like it, should be written by this author, or by some one intellectually akin to him. The schools and all their works are slowly but surely coming within the range of the critics: this book is evidence. Of course, no one but the author of The Goose Step could have written The Goslings.

The argument runs on from the former book, changing its objective only. That argument is that "the 'invisible government' of Big Business which controls the rest of America has taken charge of the schools." Some school men admit this: Dr. John L. Tildsley, district superintendent of schools in New York City, is quoted as having said, in May, 1922: "I do not know any school system in the United States which is run for the benefit of the children. They are all run for the benefit of the gang . . ." "This statement, made upon high authority, is the thesis of The Goslings."

Following our guide, we go "behind the scenes" and see this "invisible government" at work in Los Angeles: "a dozen or so of big bankers and business men, hard-fisted, cunning, unscrupulous profiteers of the pioneer type, a scant generation removed from the bad man with a gun on each hip." In Chicago and New York, and a score of other cities round the country, the same forces are at work—though the details vary from city to city. Everywhere we find graft, "reciprocity," spying and lying, false standards of value, attention to "everything in the world but study."

Leaving these city systems, we look at our "educational machines," local and national, including the National Education Association, which has become, we are told, a tool of "capitalist imperialism," which worships the Fascist ideal of power, and approves the proposal of the present United States commissioner of education that "all advocates of dangerous un-American doctrines," such as Socialism, should be "imprisoned or expatriated . . . I would even execute every one of them—and do it joyfully."

Making such distinction as is possible between facts and the interpretation of facts, we are compelled to admit that here are facts: not all the facts, nor all the important facts; but many facts, many important facts, and some of the most important facts in the whole matter. The author sees education and the schools, not as the mere playthings of childhood, but as such decisive factors in our whole civilization as to make their control a cause of endless battling. For the present, he holds that Big Business has the best of the conflict: the schools are entangled in those interlocking controls which dominate industry, government and, perhaps, the churches, and they are quite unable to escape the implications of those interlockings. Hence, Mr. Sinclair calls teachers and parents of America to action:

> Look about this country . . . not through rose-colored glasses of the capitalist press, but with your own eyes, and ask if this is a civilization with which you are satisfied. A country in which five percent of the population own ninety-five percent of the wealth and use it to increase their share of wealth and control; in which ten percent of the population exist always below the line of bare subsistence . . . in whose richest city, twenty-two percent of the children come to school suffering from under-nourishment; whose city slums are growing . . . while the farms are being deserted . . . where tenantry and farm-mortgages are growing one or two percent a year; where crimes and prisoners are increasing even faster; where between one and five millions are continually unemployed; where half a million women have to sell their bodies to get bread . . . where ninety-three percent of the expenditures of government are devoted to destroying human lives; where the surplus wealth is sent abroad to seek opportunities of exploitation, to make our flag a symbol of greed, to turn our army and navy into debt-collecting agencies for Wall Street profiteers . . . these are the facts, and 10,000 fancy-salaried administrators of education are forbidden ever to mention them, but required to tell their 700,000 teacher-geese and their 23,000,000 goslings that this is the greatest, the grandest, the most beautiful and most Christian country that God ever made.

Here is portrayed more of the educational problem of America than is usually found within such brief space. But the teachers do not understand, and their leaders do not believe it. Said the president of the National Education Association, at the recent Chicago meetings: "A man who once exposed a great wrong by means of a sensational novel . . . has ever since been seeking other wrongs to expose . . . his new book bears in almost every page the evidence of half-digested misinformation supplied to him by an enemy."

What is the defect in this book and in its argument? For Mr. Sinclair, this interlocking control of the schools has been quite deliberately planned by the Black Hand agents of the "invisible government." He takes no account of the ages of drift, the gradual accumulation of customs and habit, our "folkways" and our institutionalisms. He seems not to see that "control" is as old as the race. He seems to assume that society could, if it would, cut clean across all these drifting mazes of control and make a new start: give up its psychological character and become clearly logical. Under such a changed order, what would education turn out to be?

The schools would be centres of free intelligence, disinterested knowledge and uncontrolled science; teachers would devote themselves without fear of ultimate consequences to the development of the native originalities of the children; school administration would exist for no other purpose than to make such schools possible; school boards would have no concern save that of securing such administration and looking after the bills; the public would willingly pay the expenses of such schools without question or demur; and business and industry would accept the graduates of such schools without hesitation.

But our world is psychological in character, rather than logical, and this consummation is not likely to be achieved very soon. Mr. Sinclair realizes this. Hence, he proposes a more radical and a more rapid solution. He has no use for the "intellectuals:" they climb out of their class "upon the faces of the poor." He has no faith in educational solutions, in science, or any slow development of intelligence or of a real *social* control of education, as opposed to present *class* control. There can be no *social* control: "society" is a myth, a fallacy. We must fight class with class: there can be no escape from *class* control. The only question is as to which class shall rule. Big Business, with its interest in profits, or the Proletariat, with its interest in Humanity!

The schools cannot escape: the class war must be carried into the field of education. Teachers should join the ranks of the Proletariat and fight with their proper com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rades for the freedom of the world and of the schools. "The educator is a worker . . . and his place is by the side of his brothers of that class. 'Workers of the world, unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains; you have a world to gain.'"

There seems to be, here, no thought that an educational solution should be found for these educational problems. Like most of us, Mr. Sinclair does not believe in education. He believes in results.

But, here we are, caught, like rats in a trap, in the toils of old folkway controls—which have, indeed, grown more trap-like with the development of Big Business—and which those who are more interested in profits than in human progress have seized upon and have learned to manipulate to their own purposes. These play with "control" without understanding it, and they bring disaster upon the world, now and again, by their ignorance and ineptness. Mr. Sinclair proposes, not that we should learn how to operate these "controls" to the greater purposes of life, but that the present operators should be ousted, and that others, probably no more intelligent, should take their places. This does not contemplate education: it contemplates violence—a violence that is not made more lovely by becoming intellectual!

On the destructive side, Mr. Sinclair is a courageous and useful critic of the schools. On the constructive side, he has little to offer. It may turn out, of course, that we shall have to go his way—through the turmoils of revolution to the realization of our problems and our needs.

Even so, educational problems will have to be solved by educational methods. After the revolution, we shall still have to gather up the fragments of life, and work out the next stage of progress with experimental misgivings and thoughtfulness. It is only as we use educational approaches that we can be sure we shall reach educational objectives—objectives which can be defended by educational methods. If we seek for a social order that shall, eventually, be intelligent, we shall do well to use the methods of intelligence in bringing it into existence.

JOSEPH K. HART.

Victorian Portraits

Memories and Friends, by Arthur Christopher Benson. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. $4.50.

THE family of the late Archbishop Benson has been responsible for a good many impressions of Victorian England, the most distinguished being Our Family Affairs, Mr. E. F. Benson's charming narrative of the episcopal household and his own boyhood at home and at school. The present volume by his older brother deals with a group just outside the family circle—a group of which most of the members were connected with Eton as schoolfellows or colleagues of the author. There is first of all the portrait of Edmond Warre, the headmaster who made modern Eton, of J. L. Joynes, Oscar Browning, and E. C. Austen Leigh, who were of his staff, of Mrs. Blanche Warre-Cornish, whose husband was Vice Provost, of Stuart A. Donaldson, afterwards Master of Magdalen College, Cambridge, of J. D. Bourchier, who became the Times correspondent in the Balkans, of Cecil Spring Rice, late ambassador to the United States, of Reginald John Smith, the publisher, and Howard Sturgis. Lady Ponsonby and Mrs. Oliphant are introduced because they lived across the Thames at Windsor, where Benson was often their guest; and a sight of Ruskin was caught on his visit to Eton to address the Literary Society of which Arthur Benson was president.

The Ruskin is but a rapid sketch, caught at a single sitting, but the others are finished portraits, done at length, and at leisure. Mr. Strachey paints the Victorians as they look to a younger generation, with the revealing cynicism of Sargent, but Mr. Benson portrays them as they appear to one of themselves, with the gentle faith and rather touching admiration of Watts. He is not uncritical. In his most elaborate study, that of Warre, Mr. Benson has portrayed the British headmaster of the type between Arnold and Sanderson, with his diffuse mind and discursive method, his vague and empirical philosophy. "He had no crispness of expression; he never made an epigram. . . . He had a richly stored mind, but he could not focus or condense his thoughts." But he reveals also the secret of Warre's great influence and power. "He had every quality that goes to make up what we mean by the word gentleman—strength, bravery, courtesy, modesty, stainless honor, perfect honesty, entire innocence of mind. . . . But what made all this so effective was the deep inner strength of which I speak, no self-conscious sense of righteousness, but an unconscious sense of rightness, which made him, without any vanity or jealous scheming, or any desire to create an impression, a natural ruler and leader of men." This is the kind of verdict which Mr. Benson leaves upon his subjects, expressed with the formal stateliness of a Latin epitaph.

And so fairly has Mr. Benson drawn his characters that we are convinced that these judgments are true—that these Etonians did in very truth possess in eminent degree the qualities which have made their race a noble and enduring one. Only one picture is unfavorable, with a dash of malice in its strokes. Oscar Browning is presented as he appeared to his staid Eton contemporaries, and at Cambridge, in his singular combination of wit and buffoon. "I cannot say that we respected him; and to most of us he was a gigantic joke. . . . He was not far from being a tragic failure; his appearance was grotesque and portentous, his reputation was vaguely astray; he enjoyed no real esteem or honor, and all his colleagues in any practical enterprise were anxiously on the look-out for any opportunity of terminating his connection with its administration." We gather readily enough that according to Eton standards Oscar Browning was not exactly a gentleman.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

Europe Old and New

Europe, 1450-1789. Europe Since 1789. Two books by Edward Raymond Turner. Garden City: Doubleday, Page and Company. $3.50 each.

EUROPE, 1450-1789, is somewhat old-fashioned in its framework of the picture of the genesis of modern times, stressing too much the alleged importance of the Renaissance and Reformation, and underestimating the relative significance of the expansion of Europe and the resulting commercial revolution. Dr. Turner has scarcely caught the vision of Raynal, Seeley, Shepherd and Hayes with respect to the influence of overseas expansion upon European society. As compared with the first volume of Robinson and Beard's Development of Modern Europe, it does not differ markedly in spirit, but is far more comprehensive and voluminous. To

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

compare it with the only real rival in the field, the first volume of Professor Hayes's work, it may safely be said that Turner falls far short of Hayes in capacity for synthesis, and specifically in making it clear that the rise of the bourgeoisie was the basic fact and unifying thread in the social and political history of early modern times, but greatly surpasses Hayes in treating the intellectual and cultural forces and achievements during this period. Dr. Turner's implicit indictment of Catholic anachronisms and obscurantism is no less admirable and salutary than his appreciation of the importance of science and rationalism, but he fails conspicuously to make clear the intellectual degradation produced by Luther, Calvin and Knox as compared with Erasmus and Montaigne. Much the best chapters are those on intellectual and cultural history, to which considerable space is given. The maps are the finest which yet grace a college textbook in history.

Europe Since 1789 is a revision and amplification of the author's Europe, 1789-1920, bringing the material down to 1924. It will serve well those teachers who desire a textbook on the period since 1789 which is less detailed than the volumes of Professor Hayes and Professor Hazen's larger work, while somewhat more advanced than Hazen's Modern Europe. It is reasonably progressive in the conception of history which dominates the general arrangement and the distribution of space, but the interrelation of economic and social forces with the political factors and changes is not so clearly indicated as in the manuals by Professors Hayes and Schapiro, and the political history is far less ample than in Hazen. The treatment of the general background of the World War is free from the gross form of dualism and diabolism common a few years back, but the prevalence of nationalism, imperialism and militarism outside of Germany is not adequately emphasized. Aside from a few fossil exhibits such as the statement that the French leaders in 1914 "earnestly wished to avoid war," that Austria weakened on July 30 and would have given in had not Germany rushed into the breach to prevent the consummation of any pacific overtures, and that "the German government was directly the cause of the conflict and the principal immediate factor in bringing it to pass," the handling of the outbreak of hostilities is as fair as one may look for in the average commercial textbook for some time to come. Even more wholesome is the author's return of restraint and judgment as evidenced in his treatment of post-war Europe. Here he reveals infinitely greater poise, sanity and fairness than does Hazen in his revised Europe Since 1815, both in the treaty of Russia since 1917 and in the survey of European diplomacy and economic history since 1919.

HARRY ELMER BARNES.

Roman Poetry

Roman Poetry, by E. E. Sikes. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. $3.50.

THE chapter headings of the book—Theory of Roman Poetry, Post-Augustan Criticism, Practice of Roman Poetry, Poetry and Philosophy, Language and Style, Ornaments of Latin Verse—give no adequate idea either of its breadth or of its depth, and afford no hint at all of its attractiveness. Its learning is not narrowly confined to the facts of Roman literary history; its author is familiar with criticism from Aristotle and Longinus to Saintsbury and Croce, and ancient and modern poetry are made mutually illuminative. This does not mean that there is a sacrifice of quality to quantity. Roman Poetry is a thoroughly solid work, and will hardly interest those unfamiliar with classical letters; but the effect of its learning is multiplied by its being brought into relation with the literature and criticism of Renaissance and modern times; Mr. Sikes has assimilated the critical thought of the centuries and given new life to the criticism of Roman poetry by his universalization of it. In the field of criticism, he exemplifies the principle which he lays down in the field of poetry: namely, that originality results from the assimilation of tradition.

Roman Poetry is not one more manual of Roman literature, nor is it a book of essays in mere appreciation. It does not catalogue the well known facts of Roman literary history, but assumes the reader's familiarity with them, and interprets them. It does not fail to appreciate, but its chief effort is to lay better foundations for appreciation. It goes to the roots of the matter. Among the discussions which will be found especially stimulating are those on nature and the Latin poets, on the relations of poetry and poets with the Roman state and Roman society, on the restraints imposed by Augustan social tastes, on the theory of imitation, on pleasure and utility, on originality and borrowing, on the Dido and Aeneas episode, on alliteration, assonance, and the refrain, and on the greater nearness of our own times to the Augustans than to the Victorians. An occasional spark of humor lights the way and gives the reader a greater confidence in the guide.

Mr. Sikes in the preface writes that "some of the statements in the following pages will no doubt seem a little obvious to professional critics; but long experience as a teacher has led me to observe that many students of the Classics are badly equipped with even elementary notions of modern criticism." Whatever may be the case in England, this surely is the case in America, where it is not only possible, but almost compulsory, for the doctoral candidate to face his examiners without a really familiar knowledge of the classical literatures, with no systematic knowledge of the other arts, ancient or modern, and absolutely a stranger to either the theory or the practice of criticism; but where, in every classical publication and on every classical program, there is sure to be an article or a paper on the value of the classical study in which its effect upon literary appreciation and execution occupies a place of first importance. We laud the classics as literature and study them as the stuff for statistics. Our graduate students spend three paralyzing years in working toward the doctor's degree, and then, if they are to become intelligent citizens and teachers, have to spend another three years working away from it.

GRANT SHOWERMAN.

Recent Fiction

Wandering Stars, by Clemence Dane. New York: The Macmillan Company. $2.25.

MISS DANE employs a highly sophisticated technique for the presentation of a highly fantastic situation. In the title-story the emotional pitch is sometimes strained to the breaking point. The incidental fantasy, The Lovers, rings truer, despite its essentially mystical quality—which goes to prove that intuitive emotional sense is convincing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

even when the circumstances of the narrative are wholly imaginary. The dates appended to the stories—as well as their almost excessive polish—reveal the meticulous craftsmanship of Miss Dane's work, but tend to deepen the impression of self-consciousness the reader receives.

D. B. W.

Young Felix, by Frank Swinnerton. New York: George H. Doran Company. $2.00.

IT looks as if Mr. Frank Swinnerton is doomed to be known as the author of Nocturne. His has been the misfortune to write one masterpiece and ten novels. Oppressed by the distinction of Nocturne, Mr. Swinnerton has decided to be garrulous and to reject intensity for an interminable expansive realism. Young Felix is Mr. Swinnerton's Wild Duck, and a rather sad bird. This long confidential history about Felix Hunter from babyhood through two marriages maintains a forlorn and calculated gaiety. In trying to be gay Mr. Swinnerton succeeds is being gossipy. At heart he has always been a sober man, that is, a realist.

A. D. D.

Fantastica, by Robert Nichols, with a Foreword by John Masefield. New York: The Macmillan Company. $2.50.

IN a preface which is at once testy and florid Mr. Nichols (writing, he says, "as spring breaks") tries so hard to explain the three stories in the book that they come as progressively inferior anti-clamaxes. The best, The Smile of the Sphynx, is a spirited fantasy; Perseus and Andromeda is a Shavian comedy beginning where the mythologies break off; the third, Gogoltha and Company, is a fantastical tract with touches of Back to Methuselah. In the deplorable preface Mr. Nichols says that he likes abstract ideas and that each of his stories has for him "the attraction of anything which wriggles." One might suggest that next time he tackle something more stationary. His stories wriggle, certainly. They wriggle like a centipede with St. Vitus' dance.

J. G.

High Fires, by Marjorie Barkley McClure. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. $2.50.

MISS McCLURE sets forth the old theme of parents versus children, in the struggle between Puritanism and modernism, much as it was set forth thirty years ago by Mrs. Deland and Mrs. Humphry Ward. She writes with such abundant good faith and good will, she has such genuine feeling for her characters, especially the grand old clergyman, Angus Stevenson, and her view of life including the war is so simple, healthy and honest that High Fires is a masterpiece of the school of thought represented by the Youth's Companion and the Y. M. C. A. Readers who are shocked and pained by Flaming Youth and Janet March will turn to its wholesome pages with relief.

R. M. L.

Heirs Apparent, by Philip Gibbs. New York: George H. Doran Company. $2.00.

THE near-Shavian epilogue of Heirs Apparent proclaims Sir Philip Gibbs's faith that "Youth's all right!" despite the dismay its more startling manifestations in his vivid and diverting pages may cause "the Old People." He reminds us that responsibility has never been a salient characteristic of Youth, that the urge to reform is then iconoclastic rather than reconstructive, and that when honesty and courage are the dominating qualities of a generation one may fear for their safety but not for their virtue. Sir Philip's own courage, honesty and good humor in presenting a perplexing condition make his assertions reassuring even to the apprehensions of the Falling Generation.

D. B. W.

Half Gods, by Lynn Montross. New York: George H. Doran Company. $2.00.

INSOUCIANT, defiant pagan that she is, the girl Frances wins from us not so much our admiration as our pity. For though with her we watch her half gods vanish after so brief a reign, we glimpse the advent of no god worthy of the title or the succession. Mr. Montross's brew, strong as it gave promise of being, shows signs of having been watered—and the flavor suffers by the process.

C. N.

Contributors

FELIX FRANKFURTER is a professor of law at the Harvard Law School.

MAXWELL ANDERSON is on the editorial staff of the New York World and is also one of the editors of Measure, a magazine of verse.

R. H. TAWNEY is the author of The Agrarian Problem in the Sixteenth Century, English Economic History, Studies in the Minimum Wage, etc. In 1919 he was a member of the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education.

WITTER BYNNER, among other books, has written The Beloved Stranger, A Canticle of Pan, Pins for Wings (under the pseudonym "Emanuel Morgan") and A Book of Plays.

FRANK ERNEST HILL, a Californian, is a graduate of Stanford University, an editor of Measure, and a member of the editorial staff of the New York Sun.

EDWIN ARLINGTON ROBINSON is the author of The Man Against the Sky, Merlin, The Three Taverns, Avon's Harvest, Roman Bartholow, The Man Who Died Twice, etc.

LÉONIE ADAMS is a graduate of Barnard, and a frequent contributor of verse to the New Republic.

LESLIE NELSON JENNINGS has written verse for various publications during a number of years.

STEPHEN VINCENT BENÉT is the author of Young People's Pride and Jean Huguenot.

HERBERT S. GORMAN, associate editor of the New York Times Book Review, is the author of The Barcarole of James Smith.

EDMUND WILSON was formerly on the editorial staff of Vanity Fair and later of the New Republic.

JOSEPH K. HART, associate editor of the Survey, has written among other books Democracy in Education, Community Organization, and Social Life and Institutions. He was formerly professor of education in Reed College and the University of Washington.

HARRY ELMER BARNES is professor of historical sociology at Smith College, and bibliographic editor of Foreign Affairs. He is author of History: Its Rise and Development; The Social History of the Western World; Sociology and Political Theory, and several more technical works on historical sociology. He has given special attention to the problems of historical method and the history of historical writing.

GRANT SHOWERMAN, professor of classics at the University of Wisconsin, is a fellow of the Archaeological Institute of America, and has written a translation of Ovid's Heroides and Amores.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Road to Home

Though written faithfully, his letters from home seemed to have had a way of arriving at his hotel in one city just after he had left for the next—and of never catching up.

Three weeks passed—business conferences, long night journeyings on sleepers, more conferences—with all too little news from home.

Then he turned eastward. In his hotel room in Chicago he still seemed a long way from that fireside in a New York suburb. He reached for the telephone—asked for his home number.

The bell tinkled cheerfully. His wife's voice greeted him. Its tone and inflection told him all was right with the world. She hardly needed to say, "Yes, they are well—dancing right here by the telephone. . . . Father and mother came yesterday. . . . Oh, we'll be glad to see you!"

* * *

Across the breadth of a continent the telephone is ready to carry your greetings with all the conviction of the human voice. Used for social or business purposes, "long distance" does more than communicate. It projects you—thought, mood, personality—to the person to whom you talk.

AMERICAN TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY
AND ASSOCIATED COMPANIES
BELL SYSTEM
One Policy, One System, Universal Service

IN THE May 14 issue of the New Republic we advertised a $1000.00 prize contest, for reviews of King C. Gillette's "THE PEOPLE'S CORPORATION." We wish to make it entirely clear that this contest is entirely unrestricted and that it is not necessary to buy a copy of this book in order to enter the contest. The book may be obtained free at practically every public library in the country and copies may be read and examined at our offices.

Boni & Liveright, N.Y.

CAMP UTOPIA
Lake Ellis, Wingdale, N. Y.
A vacation ground for grown-ups
In the Berkshire Hills
120 minutes from Grand Central
Opening May 29th
Make reservations now for Decoration Day Week-End
W. J. PERLMAN, *Managing Director* — DR. WILL DURANT, *Associate Director*
Address 2000 Broadway, N. Y. C.
Phone Columbus 2454 or Bensonhurst 0759

ECOLE CHAMPLAIN
French Summer Camp for Girls
On Lake Champlain
July and August
An outgrowth of the famous Middlebury French School. All councillors speak French, being either native French or trained in the Maison Francaise of Middlebury College. Edward D. Collins, Director, Middlebury, Vermont, will send literature. For interviews apply to Mrs. M. A. Selsor, 34 So. Paramus Rd., Ridgewood, N. J. (tel. 2023-J); Mrs. John A. Collier, 282 DeKalb Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.; Mlle Bertha des Combes Favard, 5716 Dorchester Ave., Chicago, Ill.; Mme Bertha T. Dupee, 146 Massachusetts Ave., Boston, Mass.

THAT BOOK YOU WANT!
We hold an enormous stock. Second-hand and New, all subjects. On approval. Also Rare Books. Catalogues free; mention interests. Commissions executed.
FOYLES, 121 Charing Cross Road, London, England.

mothers and fathers of small children
a group, cooperatively inclined,
has
country land, white plains, n. y.
sufficient for 50 families
common acres reserved for
modern school
garden tennis courts, etc.
houses may be built simultaneously at reduction.
group must be large enough to prevent enforced intimacy and the glaring drawbacks of "suburbia."
of particular interest to professional people.
if interested, apply immediately
Stuart Chase — 2 W. 43rd St.
Alfred Bernheim — N. Y. City

Brentano's Inc.
NEW YORK
5th Ave at 27th St
Booksellers to the World
Mail-Telephone-Cable-Telegraph
ALL BOOKS ALL LANGUAGES
New York-Chicago-Washington-London-Paris

Please mention The New Republic when writing to advertisers

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED